DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 378 142 SP 035 659

AUTHOR Griffin, Gary A.
TITLE Proceedings from Seminar on Teacher Development and Linguistic Diversity.
INSTITUTION Far West Lab. for Educational Research and Development, San Francisco, Calif.; Southwest Regional Lab., Los Alamitos, CA.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Educational Research and Improvement (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE Sep 94
CONTRACT 91002006
NOTE 74p.
PUB TYPE Viewpoints (Opinion/Position Papers, Essays, etc.) (120) -- Information Analyses (070)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Academic Achievement; Cultural Context; *Cultural Differences; Educational Improvement; Educational Practices; Educational Research; Elementary Secondary Education; *English (Second Language); Faculty Development; Limited English Speaking; Multicultural Education; Second Language Learning; Social Structure; *Student Needs; Teacher Education; *Teacher Effectiveness; *Teacher Role
IDENTIFIERS Diversity (Student); *Language Minorities

ABSTRACT

This occasional paper reflects on issues raised during a seminar called "Teachers for the 1990s and Beyond," and deals with teaching and learning in schools where multiple languages are spoken by students. Central to the seminar was the recognition of the growing numbers of language minority English learners (LMELs) in schools where English is the sole language of instruction. The paper underscores the importance of recreating schooling in ways that will benefit these students intellectually, socially, and personally and takes the position that professional educators must be mindful of students' home cultures as a prerequisite to making meaningful changes in schools and classrooms. The paper urges a transformation of teaching toward the ends of English language competence as well as subject matter competence, linking the two through reconsideration of appropriate pedagogy; encourages reconceptualization of teacher education as an important foundation for altering teaching and schooling; and suggests a serious rethinking of the features of schooling as a vital component in increasing the influence of teaching upon LMEL learning. The paper concludes with a comprehensive research and development agenda. Eight papers delivered at the seminar served as a basis for this discussion. A list of authors and titles is appended. Contains 39 references. (Author/LL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

SP

Southwest Regional Laboratory

4665 Lampson Ave., Los Alamitos, CA 90720

(310) 598-7661

ED 378 142

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

SB035659

September 1994

2

Proceedings From Seminar On Teacher Development and Linguistic Diversity

Gary A. Griffin

University of Arizona

3

September 1994

Prepared under a subcontract with Far West Regional Laboratory for Educational Research and Development (contract no. 91002006, U.S. Department of Education). The content does not necessarily reflect the views or policies of Far West Laboratory or the U.S. Department of Education nor does the mention of trade names, commercial products, or organizations imply endorsement by these agencies.

CONTENTS

Preface *v*

Abstract *xi*

Introduction 1

Today's Schools, Today's Students 2

Students: Who Are They? 8

Caring: A Question of Value and Disposition 14

Pedagogy: Teaching All Children 17

Teacher Education: Learning To Teach All Children 28

Community: Places To Teach All Children 40

What Now? A Research and Development Agenda for Teaching LMELs 46

- Matters of Competence 50
- Matters of Teacher Beliefs, Theories, And Expectations 51
- Matters of School Context 52
- Matters of Student Identity 53
- Matters of LMEL Assessment 53
- Matters of Professional Resources for Teachers 54
- Matters of Teacher Preparation 55
- Matters of Teacher Roles 55
- Matters of Staff Development for Experienced Teachers 56

Conclusion 57

References 59

Appendix 65

FORWARD

In 1993, Southwest Regional Laboratory's (SWRL's) Metropolitan Educational Trends and Research Outcomes (METRO) Center sponsored a seminar, Teachers for the 1990s and Beyond. The two-day seminar bridged the perspectives of research, practice, and policy in two relevant areas: teacher development (covering professional preparation, induction, and professional development), and promising educational practices identified for the ethnolinguistically diverse. Eight papers were developed and served as focus for discussion[1].

Gary A. Griffin facilitated the seminar, and this occasional paper is his reflection of issues raised across the two days along with what he feels are salient considerations for those who engage in educating teachers who instruct in the multicultural, multiple language classrooms of the Pacific Southwest.

Central questions addressed in the seminar include:

1. What demands must teachers be prepared to meet in the 1990s and beyond in order to provide for increasingly more culturally and linguistically diverse populations in terms of (a) effectively teaching them, and (b) effectively participating in improving and restructuring the education programs in order to meet their needs?

2. What education strategies appear promising in terms of ensuring that culturally and linguistically diverse student populations (a) are provided equal access to quality academic instruction, and (b) for those who are English learners, provide for developing their English proficiency at an acceptable rate?

3. What approaches to teacher development have the greatest potential for preparing teachers to assume these responsibilities? In what ways, if any, do they differ from current models?

---

[1] The Appendix to this occasional paper includes a list of the authors and titles of their papers.

The importance of these issues is apparent in the school districts in which SWRL works. A large influx of immigrants from Mexico and various Asian and Central and South American countries, along with significant numbers of African American students and a sizable Native American student population in Arizona, guarantee that schools in the Pacific Southwest will be increasingly populated by students among whom multiple languages and cultures are represented.

Consequently, teachers in SWRL's region often teach students who are more ethnically, linguistically, and racially diverse than anywhere else in the nation (Evans, Wals, Smreker, & Ventresca, 1989). In a given classroom, there can be students from as many as six different ethnic backgrounds, among them speaking three or more native languages other than English. A significant portion of them may be LEP as well (Tikunoff & Ward, 1991).

The educational challenge is clear. Like all students who enroll in the nation's schools, those from minority cultural and linguistic backgrounds are legally guaranteed equal access to quality education. This requires that schools provide educational programs that promote their academic success while concurrently providing for development (at an acceptable rate) of English proficiency for those who require it.

While the changing student population presents numerous challenges to teachers and other persons involved in teacher development, future agendas for school improvement/ restructuring also hold heavy expectations for changes in teacher responsibility and performance. For instance, new approaches to student performance assessment, including application of national standards and use of alternatives to standardized achievement tests, call for teacher participation in development and interpretation of performance measures as well as application of them. New models of schooling that incorporate high technology and school-business collaboration ask teachers to expand their instructional processes to include an enlarged array of human and technical resources. In addition, teachers' participation in such endeavors no longer is limited to implementation of curriculum and instructional models developed by others. They are asked to become active contributors to the design and evaluation, as well as implementation, of school reforms. In the process, they take on new roles that require skills and knowledge sharply different from those needed for effective instruction of a group of 30 or so students.

In a discussion of teacher participation in such efforts, Fullan (1990) saw the bridge between improvement at the school level and more effective instruction at the classroom level as the teacher-as-learner. But, he suggested, "The closer one links the culture of schools and the professional lives of teachers, the more complex and daunting the reform agenda becomes" (p. 21). Reconceptualization of both teaching and the teacher development process is required if persons who assume this professional role are to be both effective teachers of diverse student populations and effective contributors to reform of the schools in which the students are enrolled.

The ideas advanced in this occasional paper suggest some ways to accomplish this. Griffin has skillfully drawn from issues raised in the seminar to lay the foundation for reconceptualizing teacher education to incorporate knowledge of students' home cultures and languages in the process of making education more meaningful for them. In his opinion, teachers must be prepared to develop their students' English language competence as well as subject matter competence, and he suggests that this might cause consideration of appropriate pedagogy to attain this goal. Most importantly, Griffin advances a research and development agenda designed to engage professional educators in successfully addressing the educational needs of students from minority cultural and linguistic backgrounds.

If you believe, as we do, that schools can continue to change and adapt in order to remain relevant for changing student populations, and that teachers are central to accomplishing this, then you will find this occasional paper insightful and engrossing. We thank Griffin for the sensitive manner in which he pulled together the various perspectives represented across the eight seminar papers to suggest what professional educators must consider given the students that teachers confront.

William J. Tikunoff and Beatrice A. Ward
Senior Scientists
SWRL
September 1994

ABSTRACT

This occasional paper gives attention to teaching and learning in schools where multiple languages are spoken by students. Recognition of the growing numbers of language minority English learners (LMELs) in schools where English is the sole language of instruction underscores the importance of gaining control over our understanding of how to recreate schooling in ways that will benefit these students intellectually, socially, and personally. The paper takes the position that professional educators must be mindful of students' home cultures as a prerequisite to making meaningful change in schools and classrooms. Building upon that knowledge, the paper urges a transformation of teaching toward the ends of English language competence as well as subject matter competence, linking the two through reconsideration of appropriate pedagogy when working with LMELs. The paper urges considerable reconceptualization of teacher education as an important foundation for altering teaching and schooling, and suggests a serious rethinking of the features of schooling as a vital component in increasing the influence of teaching upon LMEL learning. Arguing that our knowledge about LMELs in the nation's schools is fragmented and fragile, the paper concludes with a comprehensive research and development agenda that needs attention as professional educators engage together to better understand and act positively on issues central to LMEL school participation.

Gary A. Griffin is a professor of teaching and teacher education at the University of Arizona. His research and teaching are focused on school change, teacher education, staff development, and action research. He has written extensively on these and other practice-related educational issues. Griffin's experience includes teaching and administration in Santa Monica, CA, schools, professional work at Teachers College, Columbia University, research activity at the Research and Development Center for Teacher Education at the University of Texas at Austin, and dean of the College of Education at the University of Illinois at Chicago. He earned his bachelor's, master's, and doctoral degrees at the University of California, Los Angeles.

It may be apparent that the author of this paper is a middle-class, middle-aged, Anglo male. In some ways, this places limitations on the occasional paper, limitations that derive from an absence of direct, personal experience as a non-English speaker in American schools. I hope that these limitations are equaled, if not overcome, by the contributions that emerge from longtime serious investment and experience in teaching, teacher education, and schooling.

INTRODUCTION

This occasional paper takes as its central concern the issue of teaching and learning in classrooms where multiple languages are represented across the student population. By linking teaching and learning, it is clear that I take the position that what teachers know and how they interact with students influences learning. This relation between teaching and learning has been demonstrated in correlational as well as experimental studies in monolingual classroom environments and is a commonly held belief across all classrooms. That is, research has shown the link between teaching and learning in English-only classrooms and some bilingual classrooms, but I believe that even in the absence of empirical validation there is such a link in classrooms where systematic inquiry has yet to take place.

Similarly, the occasional paper is written from a perspective that places teaching and learning as part of a larger system of thought and action, a system that may or may not be helpful as teachers and students make sense together. I cannot ignore the impact on teaching that is possible when schools and school districts are intellectually and practically enriching environments, when teachers have opportunities to continue to learn to teach, when teacher preparation programs are connected thoughtfully and realistically to the practices of teaching and schooling, and when research and development are rigorously and solidly conceptualized and carried forward.

The purpose of the paper is to tease out lessons, hints, hypotheses, and speculations about teaching and learning in multiple-language learning settings and to present what these initial understandings lead us to think about as possibilities for practice, for teacher education, and for research and development. This is a formidable task in large part because of the dearth of systematic inquiry into what is seen by many as a new phenomenon: the ever-increasing numbers of elementary and secondary school students whose first, and often only, language is other than English.

This occasional paper is not meant to be a definitive statement about teaching in multilingual settings. Instead, it sets forward a statement of the issues facing teachers, administrators, and policymakers; advances a set of understandings that seem to me to be reasonable when working with multilingual classroom groups; and proposes a research and development agenda that, over time, may contribute to the robustness of the meaning of teaching and learning in settings characterized by multiple language minority English learner (LMEL) languages. The primary emphases of the paper throughout are teaching and

teacher education, how teachers come to make sense out of this complex work, and what they do in their work with students.

TODAY'S SCHOOLS, TODAY'S STUDENTS

Consider the following story, a slice of life in an urban elementary school that may put names to statistics, substitute human conditions for generalizations, and anchor the issues at hand in the lived world of classrooms and schools.

The playground of this city elementary school is dotted with groups of boys and girls clustered together as if to ward off the early morning chill by their collective effort. For the most part, the children seem to be drawn together by two features—age and ethnicity. The very young, some still waving good-bye to parents and other adults, huddle together on the fringes of the playground while the older students seem to have taken ownership of the sports-specific areas, congregating at the tetherball poles and near the pitcher's spot of the baseball diamond. Although there is some semblance of an age-related pattern here, the more dramatic picture is one of Anglo students talking excitedly together while Asian students do the same nearby but with distinct physical distance separating the two groups. Similarly, the Hispanic students gather together but apart from the Anglo and Asian boys and girls.

Of course, there are exceptions to this general picture. Two Hispanic boys role-play baseball batting practice along with Anglo boys; an Asian boy and girl are involved with English-speaking students in a high-pitched conversation about last night's episode of a popular television program; and seven or eight equally represented Asian, Anglo, and Hispanic kindergarten children play a game of tag that seems to involve passing a paperback book back and forth without dropping it. The children, almost without exception, demonstrate the high energy associated with youthfulness, appearing to exult in the freshness of the morning and one another's company.

Continued observation does nothing to erase this impression of good-natured childlike horseplay. But, closer examination also reveals another characteristic of these groupings: They all appear to be based upon shared spoken language. The Anglo students speak English, the Hispanic students speak Spanish, and the Asian students, depending upon the group's members, speak Korean or Vietnamese languages and dialects. It appears that language is the bond that draws together these students at this school. When students whose ethnicity is different from that of a group's dominant membership are active in the group, these students share language ability with the majority. The only

cross-language group affiliation seen here is from an Asian language or Hispanic language to English, not the reverse.

A bell rings to warn students that they are expected to go to their classrooms. Maintaining their language-ethnicity affiliations, the children move toward the schoolroom doors, doors that fan out onto the playground from buildings that hold from four to six rooms. Occasionally, a younger-with-older student pair breaks up with each party heading toward a different entrance. Some good-natured jostling occurs as the students reach the classrooms but diminishes as they enter.

The organized confusion that characterizes many elementary classrooms is evident here. Young children head for their teachers, seeking attention, some bearing toys and other favorite possessions. Older students drop homework in designated spots. In some classrooms, students seem to be habituated into immediately picking up a new or familiar book and beginning to read. Others move to their seats and wait for instructions. Still others begin work on in-progress projects involving reading, writing, making, doing, and/or experimenting.

In short, a surface examination of this start of another school day reveals what might be seen in almost any good elementary school in the city, perhaps in the nation. Closer scrutiny, however, reveals a persistent pattern not unlike that observed in the schoolyard. In many classrooms, Asian students affiliate with other Asian students, Hispanic with Hispanic, and Anglo with Anglo. In a few, mostly upper-grade, classrooms, however, there seems to have been an attempt made at cross-ethnic and cross-language grouping of students. There is a distinct difference in the student socialization patterns between the language-affinity groupings and the cross-language groupings. This difference shows up in the numbers and duration of student-to-student conversations, with the most frequent and longest-lasting student conversations occurring in the language-affinity groupings.

Two classes seem representative of the two modes of student grouping. Ms. Anderson teaches fifth grade and the students in her classroom sit together according to personal choice, the choices almost exclusively accompanied by language bonds. Ms. Carson's third-grade students have been grouped with special attention given to ensuring that students whose first language is other than English are surrounded by English speakers.

As the school intercom's tones signal that the school day has officially begun, Ms. Anderson moves to the front of the room and signals by a touch of her finger to her lips that the students are to be silent and listen to the announcements coming from the

school office, announcements directing some groups of students to sign up for after-school activities, signaling the completion of a fund-raising drive, encouraging upper-grade students to volunteer for an upcoming sports event, and reminding teachers that midsemester grade reports are due in the office at the end of the week.

In what appears to be an accustomed pattern, Ms. Carson's eight and nine-year-old students remove basal reading texts from their desks and regroup themselves around three sets of tables. At this moment, it is striking to see the Anglo students sitting together at two of the tables and the Anglo and Hispanic students at the third. Moving to this last group, Ms. Carson begins showing, one by one, a set of well-worn flashcards, each printed with a simple word—look, see, house, school, boy, girl, and the like. Unevenly, the boys and girls say the words aloud, some with obvious confidence, some diffidently or hesitantly, and others only after their classmates have pronounced the words. After several minutes of this activity, the boys and girls are directed to open their books and round robin reading begins. Even the previously confident students stumble over the words in the story, an account of a visit to a typically Midwestern farm, with some students looking expectantly for clues toward Ms. Carson while others keep their eyes on the page and, often, remain silent until the teacher supplies the unknown sounds of the unknown words. As this goes on, the other two groups of students read silently and some begin to write in what appear to be reading-related journals.

Across the courtyard, Ms. Anderson is greeting a new student, a solemn Asian girl dressed neatly and plainly, who looks around the classroom for a brief moment and then fixes her gaze firmly on her shoe tops. Ms. Anderson asks the new student how her name is pronounced. The girl remains silent. Ms. Anderson asks if anyone in the class knows the newcomer. No one responds in the affirmative. Putting her hand on the girl's shoulder, the teacher guides her to an empty seat at a table where three other Asian students already are seated. She turns back to the rest of the class, mumbles something to the effect that "we will all try to help our new friend on her first day in this school," and begins a briskly paced talk about poetry, concentrating principally on meter and rhyme.

The morning in the two classrooms moves along with an obvious central focus on language, primarily written language. Ms. Carson's students read, alone and with the teacher, with some occasions of writing in journals or responding to questions

on a work sheet. Ms. Anderson's students listen to the teacher talk about poetry and then try their rhyming abilities aloud while the teacher writes some, not all, of the rhymes on the chalkboard.

This morning view of the two classes illustrates a prevailing pattern, a pattern of difference between the two teachers' methods. Ms. Carson's approach tends to be print bound and Ms. Anderson's tends to be teacher-driven through considerable lecture and some discussion followed by individual student writing tasks.

There is, however, a similarity across the two classes. In both groups of students there is a core of a half-dozen or so students who are not engaged, either by text or by the teachers' often vibrant and lively talk. In these two classes, the boys and girls do not speak, and most often appear not to understand, English.

In both classes, the teachers make attempts to connect the LMELs with the lessons. They do this in various ways. Ms. Anderson uses Anglo students as her good-willed interpreters, but their interpretations are mostly in laborious and often very dramatic sign language. She has "assigned" a helper to each of the Asian and Hispanic students, the helper's job to keep their LMEL peers synchronized with the learning tasks of the day. In Ms. Carson's class, the teacher spends considerable time with each of her LMELs, focusing their attention on tasks that involve tracing letters of the alphabet, coloring balloons marked with numerals, sorting differently shaped paper cutouts, and the like. The students in Ms. Anderson's class listen carefully to the "helper" students, sometimes understanding what they are to do and sometimes not, and the students in Ms. Carson's class work diligently on the small-scale tasks that seem to be associated with their success in this classroom.

(Let's take a break from teacher- and student-watching and find out a bit more about two representative students, third-grader Luis and fifth-grader Hon. Luis, along with his parents and his two sisters, one older and one still a baby, live in a small apartment several blocks from the school. Only the baby was born in the United States; the other family members were born in Mexico, in the small fishing town of San Carlos on the Gulf of California. The family moved to the United States after considerable urging from other family members who had been immigrating sporadically over the past several decades. The welcome they received from their family was joyous, whereas the welcome they received from a variety of civic institutions was less enthusiastic. Luis' father found work with a landscape company where an older brother was employed. Luis' mother

stayed home with the baby. Luis and his older sister were enrolled in school, an occasion marked with solemnity and orders that they be "good students" and always to "give respect to the teacher." Beyond these admonitions, Luis' parents had little advice or counsel to offer their children.

Luis' life has three dominant features. He goes to school each day, taking his own lunch so that he is not required to eat the cafeteria food, spending his time in the school alternately playing with newfound Mexican American friends and trying to make sense out of life in a classroom that is far removed from his prior experience. He also helps out after school at a family friend's very small convenience store, running errands, neatly arranging the goods on the few display shelves, and sweeping the floors in the late afternoons. The most important of Luis' current life patterns, at least for the present, though, are the occasions when family and friends gather, sometimes formally and sometimes on the spur of the moment, to celebrate birthdays and anniversaries and other special occasions or just to be together and talk, mainly about Mexico and life in San Carlos. These times are full of vigorous chatter among grownups and children, with the youngsters acting as both helpers to the older folks and as companions to one another. The noise level often is high, the conversations sparked with inside jokes and family lore, and the camaraderie is jubilant and infectious.

Hon, the newcomer in Ms. Anderson's class, lives a bit farther from the school but still within walking distance. Her first day at school is only her fifth day in the United States, the new home of her family after an arduous and long trip from Vietnam. Similar to Luis' family, Hon and her parents and younger brother were welcomed by family and acquaintances from their native land. All live in a small area of the city that is populated almost exclusively by other Vietnamese. Hon isn't yet sure she's glad to be in "America," although she already has made friends with a young neighbor and has found that moving around her neighborhood isn't difficult—there always is someone to answer questions or give directions or smile at her. She recognizes some of the lettering on the signs in the shop windows, knows that a restaurant owner is a friend of her father and is kind, and understands that she is expected to do well in school so that she will be successful in her new country.

But Hon already is puzzled about a number of new experiences. Her next-door friend says that she thinks she likes school but that it is hard and she doesn't know what to do much of the time. The walk to the school, taken with her mother for

practice the day before she enrolls, pulls her away from the few familiar sights and sounds in her immediate neighborhood. There are few recognizable features or sounds associated with the people she sees as she nears the school. And she becomes nervous when she thinks about all of the boys and girls playing games on the playground, unknown boys and girls and games. Hon takes comfort in knowing that there always is her home and her family and her family's friends—people who understand her and whom she understands, men and women and children who "know" the same things and come together to celebrate what they "know" together.)

Back at the school, the midmorning recess finds the students back on the playground, again in self-selected language-defined groups, and the two teachers talking together as they enjoy a few minutes of the now balmy early spring morning. Their talk is light, for the most part, with references to a new teachers' union stand on health benefits, an upcoming evening at a local theater for Ms. Anderson, some good-natured grousing about the school's new lunch schedule, and speculation about what the district's in-service sessions will be about for the rest of this year. At one point, Ms. Anderson tells her colleague that she "got another one" this morning, telling about the arrival of the Asian girl, and wonders aloud, "How I'm supposed to teach when the students can't understand anything I say?" Ms. Carson agrees with the additional comment that "we simply don't get enough help teaching these students."

Who are "these students"? What kind of help might be available? How can teaching move forward so that the LMELs learn? What can schools and school districts do to help teachers? What beyond typical teaching strategies and intact curriculum expectations may be required for both teachers and students to testify that their time together is well spent? What foundation of knowledge, skill, and disposition should be in place for successful teaching and learning? How do teachers come to know and understand the possibilities, in addition to the restrictions, that are inherent in coming to grips with multilingual classroom groups? What knowledge is of most worth for LMELs?

These are some of the questions that have guided me in preparing this occasional paper. They arise in part because of a sense of urgency that is prompted by knowing many boys very much like Luis and many girls very much like Hon. They prompt me to redefine what it is to "do" teaching and schooling, to promote learning for all children, including "those" children. The

questions swirl around in the policy arenas of our nation and they hover over the teaching and learning settings in our schools. And they call loudly for response, characterized by serious thoughtfulness if not by certain and surefire answers.

STUDENTS: WHO ARE THEY?

Tikunoff (1993) uses the term LMELs to both avoid casting students in negative ways (as in "LMELs proficiency") and to frame the issues of teaching students who *have* language but whose language is not the dominant one in U.S. elementary and secondary school instruction, where English is inarguably *the* language of schooling. This sensitivity, delineating an issue without casting blame on children and youth, has been sorely lacking in much of the national conversation about language and the larger society.

Classic examples of blaming the speaker abound, from anecdotal accounts teachers tell teachers about the "odd" or "dumb" or "bad" students who fall outside the narrow ethnic and linguistic frame of schooling in America, to state and community policy initiatives that aim to proscribe the language of the society to English only. Although today's concentrations of LMELs most often are speakers of Spanish or a variety of Asian languages, our nation's history is pockmarked with the various forms of prejudice that have arisen because of obvious markers of difference, whether that difference is denoted by dependence on Polish or Yiddish or German words and phrases, or, as is still true in many countries of the world, by regional or class differences *within* a language system. Shaw demonstrated the latter in *Pygmalion*; American writers of the last century have demonstrated the former in works as sharply different as *Becky Sharpe, Stella Dallas, The Last Hurrah,* and *Bonfire of the Vanities*. In some cases, language becomes synonymous with class; in others, language is used to point out and remark upon distinctions between and among cultures; in still others, the nature and use of language are seen by some as a reliable proxy for intelligence or a suspected absence thereof.

Whatever the case, language is an obviously significant part of who we are, as individuals and as a people. Further, it is an obvious way to sort people, to name "others," to illustrate differences. Sadly, in my view, the sorting and naming and illustrating tend most often to suggest deficiencies in the sorted, the named, the other. "They" are not like "us." We know this because we speak different words, use sharply contrasting inflections, have different organizational structures to hold words together, and make sense with the words we have. Naturally, the

words we use connote our shared heritage (which others do not share), provide us with a cultural shorthand (which others have not learned), and help us to form communities of interest (which bar entry to others).

Seldom, especially in English-dominant instructional settings, are the differences celebrated as assets to the larger community, as artifacts of civilization to be shared and passed around. The great exception here, of course, is related to the persistence of a widely practiced though seldom acknowledged class system that applauds the elite when they are fluent in more than one language and whose schools promote this as a very highly desirable characteristic of the well-educated person. In very blunt terms, the middle and upper classes ask for foreign language for their children but often are resentful of attempts to ensure that a second language, English, is part of other students' ways of moving through their world.

Consequently, making schools sensible learning places for LMELs becomes a problem to be solved, an issue to be resolved, a difficulty to be overcome. These rhetorical naming games mask several relatively ugly facts, such as the consequences of not meeting the almost mandatory English proficiency requirement to hold a good job, or the predictable social consequences of not being functionally literate in English, or the feelings of isolation and apartness that accompany the LMEL as he or she seeks fulfillment in school learning. As long as we continue to believe that it is not or should not be the school's responsibility to make learning accessible in English-spoken-here environments, we face the possibility of losing the contributions of Luis and Hon and their brothers and sisters as we continue the journey of making our democracy together.

Moving from the personal stories of Luis and Hon and into the arena of nameless and faceless statistics, we find that there has been a fairly recent surge of in-migration to the United States from Mexico and from Asia. Macias (1993) tells us that the 1990 population figures include close to 10% of people who were not born in the United States, that the increase in Hispanic persons in the decade from 1980 to 1990 was slightly over 50%, that the increase in Asian-born and Pacific Islander natives in the United States was over 100%, and that the Hispanic population growth, too often considered unidimensional, was made up of men, women, and children from at least eight countries of origin.

Of the over 9 million Spanish speakers in the United States, it is estimated that as many as 8 million have difficulty with English. The implications of these statistics for schools are

enormous. Assuming that the 8 million "English-difficulty" people include children *and* their parents and aunts and uncles and grandparents—that is, the generation that welcomed them to this world and that typically assumes major responsibility for initiating them into the ways of this world—it is likely that the opportunities for the young to learn and use English are severely restricted. In days gone by, it was assumed that the older generation provided an English-literate environment for children and that this provision would be beneficial as the boys and girls became students in schools. Now, it is no longer possible or reasonable to make this too-often unacknowledged assumption. If one believes that schools are the vehicle for citizens to enter the society in fulfilling ways, for themselves and for the larger culture, the statistics about language and millions of the students in our schools are chilling.

Similarly, and closer to the schools and classrooms we are concerned about, Ward (1993) notes that a sample of 1,422 teachers in California schools reported that they worked with at least three non-Anglo groups in their classes. *Not one teacher reported working with student groups that included only Anglo students*. These California data are representative of three sets of states, those on the border with Mexico and those coastal states that receive immigrants. The data also are representative of nonborder or noncoastal states where there are large population centers, where large cities always have provided havens, job opportunities, anonymity, and gathering places for strangers to the land. It is in these places that the lives of Luis and Hon are lived out in homes, neighborhoods, schools, and classrooms. It is in these schools and classrooms where educational professionals are first meeting the new student, new because of lack of historical presence and, hence, familiarity. (A thoughtful and comprehensive picture of the ethnic makeup of the United States can be found in Roberts' (1994) interpretation of the 1990 U.S. Census reports.)

This change of business as usual is dramatic for many working in schools, in some measure because of the aging of the teacher population. It is not difficult to find teachers for whom the new wave of immigration is seen as a disorganized and altogether unwelcome shock, or series of shocks, given the magnitude of the statistics cited earlier. It is unlikely that most of these teachers, prepared as they were for teaching decades ago, have given sustained thought to how best to work with these new students. It also is unlikely that they are being helped by equally graying support colleagues to devise and test out ways of

working with students who do not have deep roots in their long tenures as teachers.

In many ways, and unlike decades as recent as the 1950s and 1960s, teachers and students are meeting as true strangers. There always have been intellectual and social and class differences between teachers and the taught—now we are experiencing differences of a deeper and more potentially fragmenting nature, differences rooted in how (or whether) we communicate with spoken and written language, and differences that arise because of the absence of a culture that is shared in large part through mutual understanding of a common language.

Trueba (1989) tells us that "the school is the gateway to mainstream America for ethnolinguistic minorities" (p. 2). At issue in the last few years of the 20th century is whether the gateway is open, closed, or open for some but not for others. The American school and the educational professionals in it, for the most part, are unable or unwilling to keep the gates open, to provide the educational opportunities that will truly serve students over lifetimes of participation in the United States. Instead, students' personal circumstances overcome the efforts of the school, as children and youth struggle to find places for themselves in schools but who maintain or develop identities out of school.

As in the cases of Luis and Hon, the school too often is an alien place where the children are lost, admittedly lost among others, but lost nevertheless. Outside of school, however, there are numbers of opportunities to interact with family and friends whose language is shared, whose cultural identities are familiar, and whose values and understandings are the stuff of common exchange. As is true for almost all students in schools, the influence of out-of-school experience is probably more powerful than the five or six hours each day when young people are participating in the ongoing national experiment of universal and mandatory enrollment in schools.

This imbalance of influence upon boys and girls of school and nonschool experience is different for LMELs than for English-speaking students. In the case of the English speakers, what is learned outside the schoolhouse door is carried by the same cultural transmission system and, thereby, open to cross-context comparison and examination. The cultural signals, often differently demonstrated, take the same general shape and form and texture. For students who have little or no English, however, the cultural icons, traditions, values, and perspectives almost are always different, oftentimes dramatically. The language issue,

then, isn't just one of translation across lexicons. The language issue is one of intricate patterns of meaning embedded with social, cultural, historical, and personal meaning that most frequently are not immediately subject to that technique called "translation."

In the past decade, the world has borne witness to the ways that translation of words from one language to another has demonstrated sets of underlying understandings and assumptions that simply do not make the journey whole across languages. Conceptions of democracy, for instance, at first became ready touchstones for ways of thinking about the original reorganization of a number of East European states, but subsequently break down as adequate descriptors of ideas and events marking the first efforts of those states to transform themselves.

Similarly, students in schools, whether recent newcomers to the United States or youngsters whose immediate families and communities have maintained close proximity with one another, are thrust into settings where they may acquire the cosmetic ability to name common objects, for example, but where the deeply embedded values, assumptions, and norms characteristic of the American school either are hidden from their view or in stark contrast to the culturally habitual ways of knowing that are hallmarks of their out-of-school experience.

Again, Trueba (1989) reminds us that "[l]anguage is the primary instrument with which we express and transmit culture, maintain it, teach it, and adapt it" (p. 29). This view of language as "culture highway," like the real-life phenomenon from which the metaphor is drawn, often is insensitive to or disdainful of roadblocks, unclear signal systems, the slow-moving traveler. When this powerful cultural instrument, language, is unknown or only partly understood, persons outside the privileged inner circle remain the nonknowers of the rules of the road. They may create parallel societies but, unlike very young children who engage in parallel play and then move on to more integrated interactions as a function of maturity, those societies most often continue to exist outside the dominant one and are marked by their semiexotic nature, exotic because of the linguistic determination of the "other."

Confounding the issue of the interaction of language and culture is the unfortunate fact that large numbers of LMELs in the nation's schools exist in extenuating personal circumstances. In large part a testimony to the importance of sharing a society's dominant language, these children and their families often live in

poverty, outside the network of support that accompanies membership in the middle and upper classes of the nation. The culture of poverty overlaps the culture of the "other" with remarkable sameness.

Schools, by their very nature as instruments of the broader social organization of the nation, can become the places where "others" in the society can become part of "us," where "we" and "they" are joined. At issue is whether school people have the wit and the will to accomplish the formidable task of reaching into the concentric circles of linguistic difference, cultural distinction, and personal circumstance.

Long ago I learned from a forgotten source about something called the Whorf-Sapir Hypothesis that states that a person's thoughts are limited by the lexicon of the language he or she acquires. Through language we impose a model on our surroundings, giving a word to each construct we derive from observation. If we don't have adequate language for something, we are less likely to discuss or think about what it might be.

The story of Luis and Hon in and out of school demonstrates a set of possible avenues that might be taken as men and women of goodwill come together to rethink how the nation's schools can reinvent life in schools and classrooms such that *all* children learn through giving language to things and ideas and events, develop sympathetic and thoughtful relationships with others, and can depend upon a playing field that is considerably more even for all players than currently is the case. Attention will be given in this occasional paper to value and disposition of school professionals, current understandings about teaching that may have potential for working well with LMELs, how teachers might better learn to teach LMELs, the characteristics of schools and communities that might be called upon to support teaching and learning, and how school curricula can be reshaped to link more thoughtfully to the dilemmas faced by teachers and LMEL children. The paper concludes with a set of proposed items for inclusion in a research and development agenda aimed at improving the chances of teacher and student success in school.

CARING: A QUESTION OF VALUE AND DISPOSITION

A compelling set of homilies characterized the progressive educational era in the United States. Among them were "start with where the student is," "work with girls and boys according to what you [the teacher] know about their personal interests and experiences," "work from the concrete to the abstract, the personal to the general," "engage students in *doing*, in imaginative activities aimed at occupying students' interests," and "connect the school with the students' home environments."

The theme in these and other common sayings about teaching and schooling seems to me to be that educators must have deep and serious understandings about the students they teach. Although some of the progressives, Kilpatrick in particular, believed that there were common themes across cultures capable of capturing students' interest and imagination, such as the need for food and shelter and tools and opportunities for creative and interactive expression, the clear message is that formal education is most effective when it depends in large measure on considerable investment in becoming intimately familiar with the students participating in that education. And, rather than holding that familiarity as only information, it is necessary to use it in the day-to-day decisions about curricula and teaching that characterize life in classrooms.

In the past several decades, in large measure as imitation of the Western scientific canons so central to the physical sciences (and latter-day psychology), educators have concentrated less on getting to know students as individuals than on understanding students as representative members of social groups. Therefore, we have categorization systems from which we extrapolate characteristics and apply them, in a kind of intellectual shorthand, to the students we teach. Therefore, we can talk about "learning-disabled" students, "lower socioeconomic status (SES) students," and "gifted students." Rather than moving from the particular hallmarks of specific students to general rules and principles about what those hallmarks mean in instructional situations, we start with the label and then work, often very hard and with goodwill, to fit the student to the label. Too often, in my experience, the labels simply do not capture the unique features of individual students and, when that happens, we tend to abandon further attempts to understand "these children."

If we were to make serious attempts at understanding children according to some category scheme, as starting points for working with individuals, but then move intentionally to understanding *this* student in *this* place at *this* time within that broader framework, I believe we would begin to develop the

habits of mind and action that would connect our instruction more thoughtfully to our students' learning. For example, at the tail end of the so-called Progressive Movement in the United States, it was a commonly held belief that teachers should visit their students at home at least once each semester (or that there should be someone in the school, perhaps a school nurse or counselor, who had done so). Concurrent with these home visits were child study groups whose main purpose was developing school- or grade-level understanding of specific students as ways to give greater authority to teachers' pedagogical practice and curriculum decisions. The intention, of course, was to integrate ways of thinking about students with ways of knowing about students such that the power of schooling as a social force could be widely realized.

The shift from a focus on the individual as a unique entity to a focus on the individual as a representative of an already studied and now-understood group chipped away at the progressives' understanding of the power of personal meaning making. It became unnecessary to get to know John or Betty or Tiffany because we already know so much about who they are supposed to be. (But even this shortcut to understanding students is dysfunctional when applied to Luis and Hon. Except for the broadest sweep of generalizations, we don't have at hand any well-organized body of shared meaning about the LMELs in our schools.)

At the core of coming to grips with connecting meaningfully with our students in our schools, including those whose first language is not English, for me, is a rededication to the progressive theme of paying serious attention to particular students in all of their complexities. In that the field has drifted more and more toward the generalization and away from the instance, this return to devising more personally challenging ways of knowing our students will be arduous for some and, perhaps, impossible for others. In the end, any attempt to make meaning about individuals will require a return to a way of thinking about and enacting teaching and schooling that has all but disappeared. It calls for school- and classroom-specific development of understanding and testing of hunches based upon that understanding.

The scientific tradition that has taken center stage in research and theory development in education has pushed aside a historic view of teaching and teachers. Before the middle of this century, it was widely believed by many, including most of the public, that teachers, at heart, were dedicated women and men whose

concern for personal service to the community and to its youngsters was sufficient to the tasks of teaching. That is, teachers were believed to *care* sufficiently to overcome almost any barrier to learning. Their *commitment and dedication*, using other words, drove their action and, because of their persistence based on these highly valued human attributes, they were successful with students. Think of Mr. Chips, Miss Dove, and the dedicated teacher in Wales when "the corn is green." These fictional representations of teachers captured well this spirit of care and the acting out of commitment and dedication.

This view, to some, is sentimental and contrary to what we believe we have learned about effective schools, effective teaching, and the like through research on teaching. To others, though, this view, expressed in more contemporary language, is at the core of our current ways of understanding the relation between teachers' beliefs and teacher practice. It has come to be conventional wisdom that our beliefs directly influence our work except in instances where external forces, such as those found in school and school district organizations, seriously strain our abilities to act out our beliefs. (The influence of context is discussed later in this paper.)

Observation of practice and personal experience lead me to believe that teachers who value students in unqualified ways, ways that are apart and independent of broad generalizations about ethnicity or social class, for example, are more likely to connect meaningfully with LMELs. In many ways, this valuing is expressed in the teacher expectations research literature, where it is demonstrated in a variety of forms and across a set of different settings that teachers who hold high but realistic expectations for students are teachers whose students succeed in school. Apart from the research literature, most of us have known, perhaps very well, at least one teacher who managed to reach students and, in the reaching, influenced their lives profoundly.

What is the bedrock upon which high teacher expectations are built? It is intuitively logical to believe that these expectations emerge from a value perspective that holds *all* students, not just some students, as persons of importance, of potential, of significance. If this view is held, it becomes almost unimaginable that we cannot connect meaningfully with students independent of the language they speak or the culture that surrounds them. If this view is held, it forces us to seriously reconsider business as usual when we are faced with young people who are not benefiting from our work with them. It

pushes us to invention, experimentation, and investment in finding out about and finding out why and finding out what.

As so many of our *revisionista* colleagues point out, the schools not only do not dare build a new social order, they sometimes act as accomplices in reifying the existing social and cultural differences in the current scheme of the world we share. At issue for this discussion is whether a conscious rededication to care, to inclusive rather than exclusive valuing of students, and to serious investment in understanding the students in our classes without resorting to generalizations drawn from other generalizations will provide the necessary foundation for more thoughtful and successful engagement with our LMELs-dominant students.

In short, there are abuses to suppress, abuses that might be ameliorated by our joint refusal to label, to impose differences. We must remember that identities, ours and those of the young people we teach, are always in negotiation, in flux, changing. As long as we continue to define "one," most often meaning ourselves and those whose culture and language we share, we never will be able to represent "all." We must remember that all of us are somehow contingent, not shaped forever but open to allowing and, in the best of times, helping someone "become."

If we can avoid the search for comfort and efficiency, refuse to give in to our addiction to harmony, and bring warmth and laughter and respect into places where young people are, it is possible for us to reinvent our schools and classrooms into places where we all work together for one another's success, whether or not language and culture are signals of our important and valued differences.

My position in this occasional paper is that until teachers and other school professionals come to value all students, care about all students, and commit themselves to the work required to be effective with all students, altering teaching techniques and tinkering with the curricula in schools will be only sporadically successful and, ultimately, will be drowned in the miasma of futility that already characterizes so many of the schoolhouses that shelter LMELs. All of us, especially the young, need to come to believe that good will be done to us.

PEDAGOGY: TEACHING ALL CHILDREN

Given the will, caring, dedication, and value expressed here, but not without those features, it is possible to speculate on ways of teaching that may increase our effectiveness in working with LMELs. As noted earlier in this paper, precious little inquiry has focused directly on the LMEL in the nation's English-dominant

classrooms. But, in the face of this fact, I believe there is a good deal of theory, research, and practical wisdom that can be applied, if only tentatively, to the issue at hand and will be presented here. Of course, for these speculations and others like them to be substantiated, it will be necessary for practitioners and researchers alike to experiment and test and try out our hunches. Again, though, we will only do this when we value the activity and its potential consequence, and develop the will to persist in making meaning together about schools and classrooms.

Teaching in our nation's classrooms is a complex, interactive, dynamic system of decision and action. Jackson (1968) noted that classrooms are characterized by crowds, praise, and power. Doyle (1986) describes a number of classroom features that impinges upon teaching and learning, including multidmensionality (e.g., interaction of people, events, ability differences, schedules), simultaneity, immediacy, unpredictability, publicness, and history. Sarason (1971) has described teaching as a kind of acting out of what individual teachers have experienced and a replaying of a particular school's history, a set of phenomena that leads him to understand, if not completely accept, that the more schools change, the more they remain the same. Buchmann (1989) has suggested that teachers depend more upon folk wisdom than on theory, research, or well-formulated hypotheses. In a more respectful voice, attention has been called to the "wisdom of practice" and Schubert and Ayers (1993) celebrate "teacher lore." Cohen (1991), like Sarason, concludes that schools and teachers are predictable, unchanging social agents with little inclination or expectation for alteration of conventional practice.

These scholars, and others, seem to be telling us that our schools are our schools are our schools and the prospect of changing them is dim, indeed, perhaps futile.

And yet, there are instances of dramatic reconceptualization of teaching and schooling. My reading of these cases suggests that teaching changes when teachers alter their beliefs and expectations about their work, reinforcing my argument about caring and valuing above. What I believe happens in the settings where teaching is dramatically different from the generalized norms is that teachers reconfigure their relationships with children and youth, moving from a perspective rooted in power over the students to power with the students. In these settings, students are seen as allies rather than adversaries, where student characteristics, including sharp differences in personal circumstances and language, are seen as possibilities for

connecting teaching and learning and celebrated as such.

Deborah Meier, the much-honored leader of the Central Park East experiment in New York City, notes that it is difficult to relate to students in her school "without knowing whose father died last night." This simple statement reveals a host of assumptions about teachers' knowledge of students, about holding an innate and enduring value for students as personal beings, about grounded sensitivity to students' lives, about a definition of "teacher" as sympathetic partner rather than distanced purveyor of conventional instruction as described by Buchmann, Cohen, and others who are outside what Lieberman (1990) calls the "dailiness" of teaching.

A good part of the move from thinking of teachers as somehow "born" with proclivities toward good teaching was exacerbated by the so-called "effective-teaching" research movement of the 1970s and 1980s. These collected efforts sought to answer a relatively simple question: What is it that effective teachers do that ineffective teachers do not do? Using scores on standardized tests of student achievement as sorting criteria for effectiveness, teachers whose students scored higher than predicted on the tests than teachers with lower-scoring students were carefully and systematically observed. The observations revealed that the "effective" teachers did share a set of common teaching strategies. The codification of these strategies became the stuff of research reports and, ultimately, was used as the basis for policy decisions about how all teachers should teach (Hoffman et al., 1986).

Decisions to use the effective teaching research findings as prescriptions for practice, particularly in the assessment and evaluation of beginning teachers, often were ill-advised. This is in large measure because of the narrow range of student outcomes that defined effectiveness in the original studies. For some, the direct instruction model that emerged from the studies came to define teaching, and this definition had little to do with such desirable student activities and outcomes as problem solving, hypothesis testing, synthesis of ideas and understandings across a range of school subjects, creativity, and the like. As Kirp (1990) reports about the use of Hunter's Essential Elements of Instruction, such teaching may result in the recollection of discrete facts and algorithms but has little power to cause students to know and understand concepts such as democracy, for example.

It must be recalled that the effective teaching research and subsequent prescriptive policy decisionmaking were part of

several decades of preoccupation with "the basics." School officials and a large number of teachers were under considerable pressure to demonstrate that students in schools could read, compute, and write with technical proficiency. It is not surprising that these narrow bands of expectations for students were built into most of the standardized tests administered by schools and whose results became the fodder of both political and economic debates about schooling. Test scores became the flash point for numbers of critical essays about schooling, for admonitions that teachers return to teaching factual material, and for school administrators to assess teachers according to the degree that the students in their classes performed well.

To a considerable extent, the residue of this period in the history of the nation's schools is still influential on the ways teachers are taught to teach and on the teaching methods they use as they enter the teaching work force. Although there have been growing numbers of exhortations for schools to attend more directly to sense and meaning making instead of repetition of basic skills, the Holmes Group (1986), being a major player in this return to many of the central tenets of progressive education, notes that colleges and universities and school districts have been relatively slow to take the steps necessary to once again focus on what some call "higher-order thinking skills." Currently, the national debate over standards, a proposed national curriculum, and a similarly sweeping student assessment system reflects the tension between narrowly conceptualized learning and a more comprehensive view of desirable student outcomes.

Where do Luis and Hon fit in this debate? If their teachers believe, or are instructed to behave as if they believe, in a fact-oriented instructional program, it is likely that, over time, Luis and Hon may master enough of the bits and pieces to succeed on these terms. They may even be able to pick up enough conceptual language along the way to seem proficient in the English language. At issue, though, is whether algorithm-driven teaching will help Luis and Hon succeed beyond the algorithm-oriented instructional setting. Will their learning of the basics be useful as they are thrust into nonschool settings that require thoughtfulness, problem solving, hunching, conceptualizing, and the like? Or, will they be mired, as often is also true for English-speaking children of poverty and color, in incomplete understandings of the nature of the world they share with more fortunate citizens who have developed the habits of mind associated with high levels of personal and occupational satisfaction?

How might teachers engage students with learning by using the most helpful of the past decades' effective teaching research findings and, at the same time, broaden the range of learning opportunities beyond the narrow prescriptions that emerged from those findings? The first step, it seems to me, is to consider seriously the effective teaching findings *but only as they can be justified for use with a specific student population.* In a quasi-experimental study conducted a decade ago, it was found that teachers and staff development colleagues could mix and match the effective teaching research findings as they considered carefully the possible consequences for *their* students in *their* classrooms in *their* schools (Griffin & Barnes, 1986).

In this study, conceptualized as a strategy to move the research on effective teaching findings into ongoing classroom settings, staff developers worked with teachers to discuss and debate how, whether, and under what circumstances the findings might be applicable to the boys and girls in their charge. An unanticipated finding of the inquiry was that teachers' views of their students' success was far broader in scope than the conventional standardized tests in use at the time. Teachers selected effective teaching strategies in terms of how they believed the strategies would fit these broader expectations for student achievement. The resultant instruction, then, bore some, but not complete, resemblance to the original research findings, in almost all cases because of teachers' transformation of the teaching strategies to allow for considerably more active student participation than the original studies' findings suggested.

Thus, a research finding, such as the one that concluded that it was beneficial when teachers provided students with rationales for lessons, was put into practice by engaging students, as well as the teacher, in seeking and articulating reasons for learning the content at hand. Similarly, the effective teaching research noted that teachers were more effective when they broke complex ideas into smaller, more manageable pieces. In the classes where transformation of such findings was a daily occurrence, teachers might use the technique of webbing—involving student ideas and active participation—as a means toward the same instructional end.

The lesson to be learned from these examples is that there may be a good deal to learn about teaching Luis and Hon embedded in the effective teaching research, but only if teachers are provided the opportunity to integrate these findings into their understandings of the groups of students with whom they work. In other words, effective teaching probably can be meaningfully

traced through these many studies but only in relation to a sharp and clear understanding of what the studies can suggest rather than dictate.

For some, this conclusion may be a form of methodological heresy. For me, though, it is common-sensical in the extreme because of our growing realization that classrooms and schools vary as dramatically and as sharply as individuals who can be picked out from a crowd. Teachers, to be effective in working with Luis, Hon, or any other student, must be able to link their knowledge of that student with available intellectual and practical resources, not simply be dependent on only one set of understandings.

This, then, is one way to rethink the knowledge about teaching in so-called typical classrooms such that it might be helpful in teaching in multilingual classrooms.

There also is another set of ways of teaching that, to me, seems particularly well-suited to working with children whose languages and cultures differ from one another and from the teacher's. They include cooperative learning, the project method, inquiry and discovery, and problem solving. Each candidate on this list of possibilities shares several underlying assumptions about teaching and learning, assumptions that are in marked contrast to the facts only, memory dominant, basic skills perspective.

At the heart of these and similar teaching methods is the assumption that students are social beings, concerned about and eager to participate in shaping the course of their lives inside and outside of schools and classrooms. It is this assumption that explains, in part, why so many students resist the lock step approach to learning that characterizes so many of our nation's classrooms. It also helps us to understand the difficulties encountered by the "my-way-or-the-highway" teacher as he or she attempts to force feed students with a kind of already determined knowledge fodder. And it is a matter of serious consequence for teachers who believe that student learning should be interactive, student-to-student as well as student-to-teacher.

Curiously, we group students for classes and then expect them to learn alone, to be thinking beings in a social vacuum. If truth were to be told, of course, grouping and then insisting that individuals in the group remain intellectually apart from one another is another demonstration of the disrespectful view that suggests that schools tend to be run for the convenience of adults rather than for the benefit of students. In many ways, the

effective teaching research findings provide willing listeners with ways to manage the "crowds" that Jackson wrote about; they don't help teachers with a social perspective on learning—organizing and orchestrating student learning as consequences of interpersonal discourse, debate, and invention. When teachers act out the belief that meaning is socially constructed, they seek out opportunities for student participation and student-to-student engagement. Student talk is valued and celebrated.

Another assumption underlying the teaching methods noted here is that meaning is socially constructed. This is in sharp contrast to the view that knowledge is fixed and somehow "true." If teachers believe that students can and will construct their own meaning around even the most conventional of school subjects, they will provide opportunity after opportunity for children and youth to talk things out, experiment with new ways of understanding, test alternate strategies to solve problems, and the like.

It is of concern to some teachers that they maintain control over the knowledge that is made present to students. In some ways, these teachers "lend" their understandings to their students and then ask for them back on tests. This perspective denies the probability that students, even in the most teacher-directed classroom, will make their own sense out of what transpires, even if that sense is that schoolwork is trivial and unimportant in the long run.

Another assumption that drives these student participation teaching methods is that boys and girls, and children and youth are naturally curious and innately concerned about satisfying that curiosity. Consider the differences that would characterize science lessons, for example, that were, on the one hand, based on an already determined set of steps to follow versus one that started with a question or was presented as a puzzle to be pulled apart and put back together. In the follow-the-guidelines lesson, it is likely that most students would go along with the directions, but the result is learning more about how to go through the motions with success than actually "doing" science. In a more curiosity-driven set of lessons, it is more likely that the thinking that is associated with science will be practiced and learned.

The last shared assumption across the proposed teaching strategies is that language is necessary for successful engagement. Sitting alone and listening, in Luis's and Hon's cases to an unfamiliar language, that is so characteristic of much of current teaching blunts possibilities for language development. We know with some certainty that spoken language is the

foundation upon which reading and writing are built, that it is fundamental for a person to have an oral language before he or she can read and write that language. The participatory, rather than teacher-dominated, methods proposed here all require oral participation—the acquisition and use and refinement of words in practice around issues and events and puzzles that arouse the curiosity of these social beings called students.

Cooperative learning has been shown to have considerable influence on student achievement, interpersonal relationships among students, positive views of schooling, empathy with students who are out of the mainstream, and others (Slavin, 1992). The project method, a long lasting holdover from progressive education, puts students in positions to control all or part of what they learn and how they go about that learning. Inquiry and discovery engage students' desire to find out and sort through the elements of intellectual, practical, and social dilemmas. And problem-solving opportunities capture students' interest in discovering their own capacities for and power over making meaning alone and together.

Think of the possible consequences for Luis and Hon when they are guided thoughtfully to interact with their peers, when they are called upon to engage with other boys and girls around matters of the mind. Not insignificant is the opportunity for getting to know the norms of the classroom, the expectations held for participation, the "rules of the game." Those of us who have observed students in elementary and secondary schools are continually struck by the ways that students, independent of language ability and fluency, learn from one another through signal systems, subtle or exaggerated eyebrow movement, frowns, and smiles.

Beyond these simple nonverbal exchanges of important classroom information, though, are the opportunities for language development, refinement, and use. As students come together to find out, to satisfy their curiosity, they are required to communicate. At first, this communication may take the form of simple translation from one tongue to another—"bueno" for "good for you!" and the like—but the possibilities for extending language use into more complex patterns are extensive. Figuring out why plants grow in the sunlight and not in the dark, for example, could call into necessary question the explication of concepts rather than single-word expressions. Deciding how to proceed with the construction of a replica of a geodesic dome could engage students with multiple exchanges of ideas, hunches, and suggestions. And so on.

The key here, of course, is that these activities are designed by the teacher, perhaps with student participation, with the express purpose of fostering both academic learning *and* language development for English-speaking students as well as for LMELs. This is no easy task for most teachers. We are unused to encouraging and rewarding student-to-student talk; except in the best of primary classrooms, talk by students is encouraged as a response to teacher directions but discouraged as student-to-student communication.

Teaching, though, isn't simply a matter of moving with ease through template-like strategies, following steps in iterative fashion, doing the work according to governing rules of action. Teaching, as is true for most complex intellectual activity, is made up of intricate relationships with students, with content, with time, with space, with instructional materials. Each of these relationships moves forward because of constant teacher decisionmaking.

Highly regarded teachers probably are always working within some sort of contingency plan (Carter, 1993). "If I do this, then the students are likely to do that. But if I do the other, students will probably think this." And so on. The point here, of course, is that teaching by the numbers may provide a measure of certainty for the teacher as he or she goes through the motions of teaching, but it is unlikely that such pedagogy is as powerful as it might be if it were more integrated with ongoing development of understanding the dynamics of the classroom.

The teacher who elects to engage students with school subjects in the interactive ways noted here will need to be always in touch with the split-second decisionmaking required of such teaching and learning situations. Such a teacher, almost by definition, is accompanying decisionmaking with what is sometimes called reflection in action. In other words, the teacher keeps in mind the intentions for learning, the nature and characteristics of the students in the classroom, the history of this group in this school, and the particular issues of concern about each of the students. This several-level kind of teaching, blending as it does subject matter knowledge with context information with expectations for student engagement, is probably the only teaching that will be effective in classrooms characterized by the presence of contrasting student languages.

The classrooms in which this teaching moves forward will look very different from stereotypical instructional settings. It probably will be fairly noisy in that the teacher will be promoting the systematic and ongoing use of oral language. The students in

it probably will be active because they will need to move around to gather and often construct materials to solve their problems and enrich their inquiries. Text materials may be more reference-oriented than series-like because oral communication and problem solving, rather than teacher direction, will provide the impetus for reading text. And there will be considerable amounts of teacher engagement with individuals and small groups rather than with the entire class.

Embedded in the previous paragraphs is the understanding that instructional materials, the tools of teaching and learning, will take different forms and have different purposes than is typically the case in our nation's classrooms. Rather than depending almost exclusively on paper and ink text, it is likely that teachers concerned with student language development and engagement with authentic intellectual and social issues will seek out and place in classrooms artifacts that will stimulate talk and imagination and interaction. Rather than depending upon pencil and paper exercises to offer opportunities for practice with the subject matter, teachers in these classrooms will do a good deal of interviewing and will depend in larger measure than usual on student-student conversations to ensure that all students are connected to the content of the lessons.

And it is likely, given the appropriate support, that these classrooms with the connected intentions of language development and subject matter proficiency will engage students around both through the use of technology. Newer forms of interactive computers allow students to move through if-then kinds of thinking, learning options that depend upon symbols other than only the conventional alphagraphic ones we are so used to seeing. Emerging technology also allows students to browse through centuries' worth of cultural desiderata, whether the browsing is intentional and aimed at solving a problem or casual and aimed only at satisfying modest curiosity. In all cases, however, the power of technology to transform the nation's schools into places where all children learn is considerable.

How are teachers to assess student progress in these multilingual classrooms? It seems clear to me that current standardized testing procedures are inadequate to the task in that the results of LMELs taking such tests are questionable in the extreme. Typical student achievement methods are almost exclusively dependent upon some level of proficiency in English. (This is another instance of the prevailing conventional wisdom

that the students in our schools are, as they were decades ago, primarily English speakers.)

If teachers have the dual expectations noted here, language development and subject proficiency, they must devise, or be helped to use, assessment strategies that do not depend upon English-language skills to demonstrate subject matter understanding. At the same time, they must have at hand ways of judging students' progress in English-language learning.

It is probable, at least in terms of lessons learned from recent history, that there will not be a rush to devise standardized assessment procedures and measures designed precisely for multilingual settings. If this is true, teachers will need to depend considerably on what might be termed informal assessment schemes. Charting a young student's developing vocabulary through student-made personal dictionaries will give some indication of language development. Keeping careful records of language use during and after teacher-student conversations is another. Formulating and making available a lexicon of important words, phrases, and concepts and using this as a touchstone for lessons and less formal student encounters is another. Installing and provisioning listening centers with interactive properties is another. And keeping mental records and drawing reflective conclusions is another.

At issue is the need to abandon conventional assessment procedures in the face of their limited usefulness in classrooms where several languages are spoken by the students. The informal assessment strategies proposed here are examples only, but the examples give some flavor of the necessity to be a good deal more flexible and adaptive in assessment than is typically the case in many schools. But, the admonition is not meant to abrogate the importance of gathering language and content proficiency information. Student evaluation is still of vital importance but takes new and unfamiliar forms based upon the character of these "new" classrooms.

Cochran-Smith (1993) asserts that "we need teachers who regard teaching as a political activity and embrace social change as part of the job, teachers who enter the profession not expecting to carry on business as usual but prepared to join other educators and parents in major reforms" (p. 1). The next section treats teacher education as an important element in developing stronger and more effective understanding and activity related to teaching in multiple language settings, including some attention to the issues raised by Cochran-Smith.

TEACHER EDUCATION: LEARNING TO TEACH ALL CHILDREN

This discussion takes as its starting point the importance of considering teacher education as a career-long set of opportunities to learn about and how best to practice teaching. There is a prevailing view that teacher education begins when a person is accepted into a preservice program of studies and ends when that person graduates from the program and is licensed by the state as a qualified teacher.

This view is inadequate from a number of perspectives. Preservice programs, no matter how exemplary, simply cannot capture in a limited course of study all of the ways of teaching that might be called upon in a lifetime of teaching. Knowledge about teaching and schooling and learning is growing at a faster rate than can be accommodated in a two-, four-, or even six-year program of study. Preservice teacher education, in that it is typically only loosely connected to real schools and classrooms, has little capacity to prepare its teacher candidates for the host of contrasts present in schools.

Instead of this limited perspective on becoming an expert professional teacher, an alternate one is expressed in the view that teacher education begins during the preservice years, extends with intensity during the first years of teaching, and continues throughout the teaching career. This view, expressing the professional feature of ongoing and continuous learning about one's work, takes into account the burgeoning understanding required for teaching in tomorrow's schools and accepts as a given the need for teachers to keep up with those understandings.

This continuum of teacher education, preservice through induction and into professional development of experienced teachers, calls into question a number of current observations about the education of teachers.

First, the already noted loose connections with elementary and secondary schools must be strengthened and sustained if future teachers are to be more in tune with the realities of today's classrooms. It is unlikely that Hon or Luis would be well-served by a new teacher whose understanding of teaching was developed in a few practicum experiences and the typical semester-long student teaching assignment, particularly if these program components took place in monolingual settings. The growth of enthusiasm for professional development schools (PDSs) that affiliate with colleges and universities for the dual purposes of teacher education and school improvement augurs well for this change. But the new arrangements, to satisfy the growing need for teachers thoughtful and knowledgeable about LMELs, must be inclusive of a broad range of student

populations, not just those that are typical of the historical mainstream of American education. Ensuring that students of teaching come early to understand the challenges and possibilities of working with LMELs will require conscious decisions to include opportunities to study and interact with these settings so that the educational opportunities for both students and prospective teachers are enhanced.

Second, it is widely believed that staff development, or so-called in-service education, is less than powerful in altering either the beliefs or practices of teachers. The character of typical in-service education is fragmented, sporadic, ill-connected to the persistent and new problems of teaching practice, and often driven by the fad of the moment or the search for the silver bullet of educational improvement. Counter to this view, however, is a set of research studies that demonstrated the power of a set of interacting features that were consistently associated with successful staff development (termed clinical teacher education in the original research) (Griffin & Barnes, 1986). Briefly, the model that emerged from the research studies called attention to the need for clinical teacher education to be context sensitive, knowledge-based, purposeful, well-articulated, ongoing and continuous, and reflective. These features of the model are seldom all in place in most staff development or preservice programs. For the continuum of teacher education to have cumulative power in the ongoing education of teachers, attention to staff development or in-service education from the perspective of this model may be helpful, if burdensome, in going against the grain of recurring practice.

Third, it is well known that the first years of teaching are extraordinarily difficult ones for most novice teachers. Although schools may have in place "buddy systems" or even more thoroughly conceptualized mentor programs, new teachers typically are assigned to work with the students considered most difficult to teach, have the largest number of preparations of the school's teacher group, take on more responsibility for extracurricular student activities, and receive much less helpful supervision and mentoring than they believe they need to succeed. The new teacher who moves from an English-only focused preparation program experiences few if any opportunities to learn about the challenges of working with LMELs, and essentially is set adrift in the seas of a first year of teaching that may take one of two routes. The teacher may decide that this is not the work of choice or may take the familiar route of blaming the students for lack of success or satisfaction and settle into a

resigned state of teaching by the numbers. For the continuum notion of teacher education to work well, individual schools as well as state departments of education and school districts must take major responsibility for helping the new teacher continue to learn to teach.

Last, taking seriously the continuum of teacher education also calls into question the narrow conceptualization of learning to teach that characterizes so many college, university, and school district programs. This conceptualization, already suggested, tends to aim low and hit the mark. That is, teaching often is treated as routine activity rather than what has come to be called teacher executive decisionmaking.

My view is that teaching students whose languages and cultural backgrounds are sharply different from one's own requires for support not simply a list of simple vocabulary words in the other languages, or a crash course in the most superficial demonstrations of cultural diversity. (A large California school district consistently provides teachers with a series of four or five workshops that focus on elemental Spanish, motion pictures made in Mexico, modest attempts to increase interpersonal sensitivity through learning to avoid common ethnic insults, and culminates in a Mexican dinner in that bastion of cultural integrity, The Olvera Street Historical Landmark.)

The content and the delivery of teacher education along a career-long continuum of activity, then, are in need of serious reconsideration. For the purposes of this occasional paper, the discussion that follows holds constant the issue of teaching LMELs, although there are certainly other issues that could accompany, and perhaps complement, this central one.

In terms of the content and delivery of preservice teacher education, it seems reasonable to consider the potential benefit of strengthening the research-practice connection by engaging in systematic research related to teaching in LMEL-dominated settings and to design studies intended specifically to influence practice. Moving away from descriptive and other polemic treatments of interesting or disturbing social phenomena is challenging for many in colleges and universities. To describe, to name, to label, to categorize, to develop hypotheses (rather than test them) seems to have become the *sine qua non* of social science scholarship. We have adopted the describer role rather than the improver one. (Not that there aren't many admonitions for improvement. The point here is to enjoin disciplined inquiry with the improvement orientation rather than depend only on the bright idea of the moment.) Too often, research scholars flee

problems and concerns once we have captured them in some discernible form. We must reorient our scholarship to dealing with such questions as these:

1. What are our LMEL's culture-bound perspectives on education and how can they be influential in increasing school learning?

2. How are the current conventions of schooling helpful or not in working with LMELs and what alterations in those conventions offer promise for engaging students more directly in their own learning?

3. What patterns of interaction among home, school, and community are most effective in promoting positive school outcomes for LMELs and how can they best be institutionalized?

4. How can peer interactions be influential upon learning and how can they be introduced and maintained in multilingual classrooms?

5. What patterns of teacher behavior are consistently associated with LMEL school success and how can they be adapted for different school and classroom contexts?

These questions, illustrative only, join the scholarship of research with the scholarship of school change and improvement. They provide bases for action that are empirically derived even though they may buttress conventional wisdom.

In addition to refocusing faculty scholarship, colleges and universities can contribute much to the discourse around teaching multilingual student groups through thoughtful and sustained interaction with school professionals whose daily work is directed toward these groups. The PDS proposal was noted earlier. A less formal and far less cumbersome way of establishing this engagement across organizational boundaries is through the various courses and *practica* that are typical of preservice programs of professional study. In these program components, professors and practicing teachers could come together to share views with students of teaching, engaging one another in the give-and-take that should characterize the tension between a professional college and the profession to which it is connected. Ongoing seminars involving practitioners and professors and would-be teachers could serve the purposes of raising awareness,

advancing hypotheses, learning together, formulating strategies for field tests, and the like.

Colleges and universities could include formally in their programs the content of language and culture. Rather than depending upon the individual will or whim of a professor to "expose" prospective teachers to the changing student populations in schools, language and culture could be a theme or program strand that runs throughout the programs of study. If this were to be done, language and culture would be attended to from historical, social, and political perspectives in foundations of education courses, could be objects of attention in *practica* devoted primarily to observing and analyzing what happens in classrooms, could be the focus of sample lesson planning and microteaching in methods courses, and could be a required element in the selection and maintenance of student teaching sites.

As is probably obvious, my current perspective on teaching is that it is as much a matter of the mind as of the exercise of already learned strategies to be followed. Given this stance, I believe it is important for preservice programs to concentrate more directly on how teachers come to know what they know and how they use what they know in the complex worlds of teaching practice. If this is to be done, preservice students must be more fully engaged than is currently the case in examining their own values and beliefs, testing those values against current trends in society and in society's institutions, reflecting on their own learning and the degree to which it seems to be contributing to their own sense of efficacy, weaving together the theoretical and research and practice strands of their professional studies, and working with others to construct meaningful orientations to their upcoming important work.

This focus on "mind matters" seems not to be typical of most preservice teacher education programs. In part, this is because of the very limited time in which prospective teachers spend in the programs, in part because of the competing claims for students' attention, in part because faculty in higher education institutions are sometimes sharply divorced from emerging issues of practice, and in part because there are few easily navigated routes back and forth between schools and the academy.

If these notions about preservice teacher education were used to plan programs, a typical student's program would be characterized by sustained interaction with LMELs and their teachers, reflection on and analysis of that interaction, ongoing dialogue about the nature of the difficulties encountered by both

LMEL and teacher, inquiry aimed at creating personal as well as shared meaning about the difficulties that leads to modest experimentation and demonstration, cumulatively powerful opportunities to encounter the LMEL phenomenon in a variety of guises, and demonstrating program and personal outcomes that suggest readiness to teach in multilingual classroom settings.

Programs for teachers in their first several years of service are in short supply in most parts of the nation, although considerable thought and action have gone into developing understandings about such opportunities in California (Ward, Dianda, & Tushnet, 1990). As noted earlier in this occasional paper, new teachers typically receive little supervisory or mentoring attention and often bear workloads considerably more cumbersome and time-consuming than do their more experienced peers. The sink-or-swim mentality is rampant across groups of new teachers. One major problem with this approach is that there is little evidence that those who sink are removed from the teaching ranks. Instead, unsuccessful new teachers tend to become unsuccessful experienced teachers.

The preparation of teachers has historically demonstrated few instances of what might be called political activity. Prospective teachers are called upon to center their own learning on the foundations of teaching, prevailing teaching methods, curriculum work, and the like. Seldom, though, are they required to rethink the political, social, and economic influence they may not even realize they will have when they work with children and youth. Cochran-Smith (1993) calls for teacher education to embrace this hidden aspect of teaching and put it center stage. She asks that teachers be prepared to be "heretics," education professionals who will push back against prevailing societal organizing features that assist in maintaining the persistent cultures of poverty, racism, and separation. She believes that heretics "are involved in intellectually vital and independent pursuits to try to answer some of the toughest questions there are about how to work effectively in the local context with learners who are with them and not like them" (p. 26). This view suggests the importance for teacher candidates of coming to understand themselves and to see themselves in comfortable, rather than confrontational, relationships with others who are "not like them."

This view is not dissimilar to Copeland's (1993) admonition that teachers should be prepared less to become experts in diagnosis of their students' differences than to "construct an understanding of their own processes of learning...[and] construct new knowledge that would be useful in making

appropriate meaning of students, teaching and learning in linguistically and culturally diverse classrooms." This perspective, not unlike Cochran-Smith's, pushes us away from the traditional diagnosis-prescription paradigm into a considerably more inner-directed focus on ourselves as teachers and how who we are and are becoming is yoked to the preservice students we teach. It is certainly possible that understanding one's own perspectives and concentration on creating personal knowledge systems and meaning for ourselves may lead us more to political activity than currently is the case. These admonitions to provide teacher education that rest less on algorithmic repetition of lessons already learned and more on self-understanding and self-directed construction of meaning is a potentially powerful reformation of conventional teacher education programs of study.

The issue of socializing new teachers to best practice (vs. a threshold of safe practice) has a long and troubled history. In some cases, this socialization is seen as the way to convince new teachers to "fit" into an existing set of school and/or district norms and expectations. In regard to the multilingual student populations I am concerned with here, there is little evidence to suggest that new teachers who come to match the behavior and mindsets of their more experienced colleagues will be consistently successful in their work with these students. Conversely, it is probable that successive generations of teachers will replicate the often good-willed but also often ineffectual teaching-learning settings that currently are the prevailing standard. As we know from Lortie's (1975) research, teachers tend to teach as they were taught and yearn to teach students much like themselves. This finding is particularly disturbing when one acknowledges that our students in schools are increasingly minority, many coming from harsh personal circumstances, while our teachers continue to be middle class and white.

New teachers are more often than not working at their first full-time, responsible jobs. They have been exposed to teaching in the relatively sheltered environment of the college or university. Their most recent experience probably was student teaching, a highly supervised and guided experience. Now, for the first time, they face the "crowd" of a classroom, or, in the cases of secondary school teachers, the "crowds" of several classroom groups. This transition from student teaching to full-time employment as teacher most often is unaccompanied by thoughtful and carefully implemented opportunities to learn from

experience. More often, the experience miseducates in no small measure because of the absence of opportunities to make meaning with other professionals and the dearth of helpful support in the individual schools.

It is reasonable to suggest that mentoring programs be put in place to help new teachers. It is *not* reasonable, however, to limit the expectations for such programs to an acceptance and acting out of business as usual. Mentoring programs, to the contrary, should be seen as opportunities for new teachers to continue to learn to teach as a function of interactions with mentors, *and as opportunities for new and experienced teachers to focus together on the challenges faced by both parties*. In other words, instead of seeing new teacher programs as ways to "get new teachers up to speed," they might be conceptualized as avenues for collaboration around mutually felt important concerns and issues, linked sets of events that call for inquiry and problem solving, and organized ways to increase the power of professional thought and action on classroom and school dilemmas.

Using such a conception as a guide for developing and carrying forward programs to work with new teachers pushes us away from the mindset that suggests, sometimes emphatically, that our inexperienced colleagues are somehow deficient and must be introduced to "the real world." Instead, the new, more collegial conception assumes that new teachers bring valuable perspectives and ideas to their work and, importantly, that they can be important resources now, rather than when they are more experienced, in acting on the school's concerns.

Further, it pushes those who serve as mentors to think and act considerably more like colleagues than like supervisors and evaluators. It dignifies the work of mentoring by assuming that collegial interaction is important and meaningful for both parties *and* for the setting in which it takes place. The experienced teacher continues to be considered an "expert" about the school and district but he or she also is assumed to face the same predicaments, puzzles, and dilemmas with the same sense of uncertainty as the new teacher. This, it seems to me, is considerably more realistic in terms of working with linguistic minority students than some of us might wish to admit. We *don't* know as much as we might about the possibilities of this part of our work, we aren't helped much by existing theory and research, and the predictable growth of such student populations should push us to be considerably more energetic in our pursuit of understanding than sometimes is the case.

The union of mentors and new teachers for the dual purposes of helping new teachers engage in best practice and using the collective energy and wisdom of new and experienced teachers to understand important educational issues, in this case teaching in multiple language classrooms, leads to a consideration of the ways that these pairs and others in schools (the experienced teachers and administrators) might move forward in staff development and professional development. The already noted habit of schools and districts to use staff development as a way to search out and promulgate simple panaceas for use with complex problems suggests the need for new approaches to the interactive intentions of teacher growth and school improvement.

In addition to the clinical teacher education framework presented earlier, it seems to me that several guidelines for staff development and school change are worthy of consideration and experimentation, particularly in light of the need to become considerably more thoughtful and skillful about teaching in multilingual settings.

First, staff development and professional growth expectations and opportunities should be more directly centered on particular school contexts and their important features. Although there continue to be generalizations about teaching and schooling that are helpful as we think about our work, those generalizations often mask the particular realities that make their presence known in particular classrooms and schools. The blanket claims about learning patterns, for example, do not speak to Luis or Hon. They provide average-oriented conclusions, generally age-related, that seldom are descriptive of any particular student. Similarly, claims for the effectiveness of teaching strategies most often are based upon mean scores, average number of instances of teacher behaviors, descriptions of "best-case scenarios," and the like. To repeat, these generalized statements may be helpful in terms of framing our questions about how best to work with LMELs, but they don't help us think precisely about how to work with *these* particular students. If we attend more directly and thoughtfully to the features of our own well-known contexts, keeping in mind generalizations from theory and research but not adopting them without question, together we can formulate and try out teaching methods that may be somewhat aligned with the generalized conclusions but are *very closely* aligned with what we know about the places where we teach.

Second, when we are more self-conscious about our own settings and clearer about the issues that make these settings unique, we are moved to try to act upon the dilemmas we

uncover. Typically, though, our next step is to buy a package, a consultant, a set of materials that seem to have promise for improving the character and consequences of our work. An extraordinarily important step is missing in this leap to select the magic bullet. In such cases, we are again adopting someone else's understanding of the issue, probably at a conceptually abstract level, rather than figuring out for ourselves how to satisfy our curiosity or soften the impact of our problems.

Instead of seeking answers and potential action outside our workplaces, I believe we must develop the habits of mind and the skills of inquiry that will lead us to discover for ourselves how to move ahead. The term *action research* has been around for decades. The habit of doing action research simply has not taken hold in large numbers of schools, but where it has been a central condition of schools, the consequences often are important for students and for school professionals. In several demonstrations of the strategy known as Interactive Research and Development (IR&D) (Griffin, Lieberman, & Jacullo-Noto, 1983; Tikunoff, Ward, & Griffin, 1979), teachers who centered their attention on immediate contextual concerns and issues showed that, with some assistance, they could identify important dilemmas and develop patterns of action to deal with them.

I believe strongly that if staff development and professional growth programs in schools were more focused on establishing, supporting, and rewarding *inquiry* as a norm in schools, and if that inquiry were required to be aimed at a well-articulated context issue, schools would be more productive and satisfying places for children and adults. Taking the case in point, multilingual classes, as the focus for context-based inquiry, it seems logical that teachers working collegially across experiential and educational levels would present a formidable force for understanding and change, a force much greater and with more chance for success than the typical "store-bought" panacea of the moment.

Third, I believe that school-based inquiry and preservice instruction would be enhanced by the development and use of *cases* as instructional materials. Similar to use in law, educational cases are comprehensive thick descriptions of an important phenomenon in teaching and schooling. For example, a much more thorough treatment of Hon and Luis in and out of school than appears above could be used to help prospective and experienced teachers tease out the dilemmas faced by these two youngsters and their teachers. The case need not, probably should not, present an "answer." Instead, the case gives a clear

and thorough picture of the issue under consideration, a picture that becomes the stimulus for teachers' invention, thoughtfulness, creativity, hypotheses-generation, and so on. Similar to the best reading exercises used with young children, the case poses its questions in terms of "how" and "why" and "so what" rather than "what" and "when" and "where." Cases put forth unsolved issues and ask readers to articulate the dimensions of the issues and to suggest ways of working through them.

Fourth, I believe that it is time for us to take considerably more seriously than we have the power of technology as a tool in our quest for school improvement and change. So far, the newest technologies have made few inroads into elementary, secondary, or higher education arenas. The use of technology, at least for this observer, seems to be limited to reproducing in a new form the old ways of working; conventional work sheets on computer screens comprise one example. Yet, the power of technology is considerably greater than this replication of long-engaged conventional practice. Hardware and software are available that make it possible for adults (and children) to work contingently to find possible solutions to persistent problems, to encounter cases in-depth and comprehensiveness, and to interact with the presented material toward understanding and discovery, and, of course, to learn fairly efficiently on their own the best and most powerful available understandings about their work.

Fifth, and closely aligned to the mentor-new teacher stance discussed earlier, staff development and professional growth must be more interactive and colleague-oriented than is the current case. My sense of in-service education as persistently practiced is much like the view presented earlier of students being grouped together for convenience sake but expected to learn independently because of narrow views of what learning is or could be. Little (1990) is among a set of scholars and practitioners who have demonstrated the importance of professional collegiality for accomplishing school change and improvement. The idea behind this concept is that teachers and other professional educators who persistently attend to problems of practice in dialogue, discourse, critique, and review are more likely to make inroads on important educational issues than teachers who live out what Sarason (1971) has called "the lonely profession." Teachers in isolation may make some alterations around their own classroom practice, but those alterations remain hidden from view and unchallenged by other ways of doing teaching. When the isolation factors are broken down, when teachers talk with one another about the stuff of their

professional lives, when that talk leads to experimentation and invention, when teacher interactions move from personal storytelling to context-based storytelling, the character and outcomes of schools change for the better. Bentzen (1974), as part of the I/D/E/A Study of School Change, noted that in schools that changed, there was a consistent pattern of what she called DDAE: dialogue that led to decisions that led to action that led to evaluation. This is another manifestation of the practice of professional collegiality where the staff members in a particular school context work together to puzzle out the best ways for that school to achieve its goals and meet its expectations.

Last, staff development and school change processes should be characterized by opportunities for teachers to learn from one another's practice. Carefully developed systems of teachers observing teachers have shown to be very powerful in changing teacher practice, on the one hand, and spreading important and perhaps unknown practices on the other. It often is forgotten that teachers invent new ways of working and that these new ways often are as legitimate, or perhaps more so, than promulgations for action from external "experts." In almost every school, certainly in every school district of size, there are teachers who are believed by most to be outstanding. We must introduce a norm in our schools that legitimates this expertise, that makes it public, and that honors it such that it becomes the wellspring from which others come into and refine their own expertise.

If teacher education for experienced teachers took these forms with reference to working with multiple language student groups, what might we see? Teachers in school-based groups would be assessing the language abilities of their students *across* the school, and new modes of student grouping might be tried out with some teachers exerting particular pedagogical strengths related to certain subpopulations, and teachers would be developing and field-testing modes of instruction less geared to the mythic properties of a "regular" class. These teachers would be visited by their colleagues and rich discussions of strengths and possibilities would become the stuff of professional interaction, nothing would be taken for granted as teachers systematically studied the consequences of their individual and collective action, so-called "programs" of instruction would be tested against the realities of the specific school contexts, students and teachers would experiment with technology as a means to integrate English-language development and school subject learning, staff meetings would be more like study groups than lecture-demonstrations, and perhaps even Luis and Hon would be

the subjects of case-study development aimed at better understanding how these young people can become more deeply involved in and affected by school.

Of course, this dramatic shift from the typical conventions of schooling, aimed in this instance at increasing the school's capacity to work effectively with LMELs, would take considerable initial vision and subsequent effort and determination to accomplish. It would not be inexpensive, in material as well as human terms, but there is little evidence currently to suggest that tinkering around the edges of persistent *or* emerging issues facing the nation's schools will be effective.

COMMUNITY: PLACES TO TEACH ALL CHILDREN

Schools, particularly schools with multiple cultures represented in the student population, are what I call contested spaces. That is, the competition for place, time, and status is fierce. The competition may be among ideas about how the school should be organized (e.g., cross-age grouping, nongraded, age organized, subject organized); what should be taught in the school (e.g., the history of the disciplines as school subjects, the modes of inquiry associated with the disciplines, thematic representations of cultural artifacts and tendencies); the preferred mode of teaching (e.g., direct instruction, inquiry, discovery, project method); desired student behavior (e.g., conformity, creativity, inventiveness); and so on.

What is seldom contested in the nation's schools is the place of the English language as the dominant medium for instruction, whether the language is textual or oral. As we discovered with Hon and Luis, the puzzlements that result from the placement of LMELs in English-only learning environments are many and, over time, serious in terms of impact upon learning. Adding the cultural variables that accompany single-language ownership only complicates and sharpens this dysfunctional relationship between the language of teaching and the languages of learners. What we see in so many such settings is a true absence of community, evidence of isolation in groups, and an almost visible disappearance of self on the part of some students, students who become a modern-day analogy to the "invisible man."

Yet, we know that healthy communities are influenced by and influential upon their members in positive and integrative ways rather than negative and isolationist ways. A healthy learning community would not stand for any of its members becoming invisible or unseen or unknown. It is my observation, though, that an otherwise healthy school community that faces a

dramatic shift in its student population, whether that shift is from all white to partly African American or from all English speakers to multiple language speakers, must experience considerable disruption and consternation before moving purposefully to accommodate the changes and return to a healthy state. In fact, some school communities become so caught up in the perceived negative impact of "new" kinds of students that they never repair themselves. In these unfortunate schools, it is not uncommon to hear teachers talk about "those children," to hear conclusions about parents who "don't care about their child's success," to see some students move closer and closer to the margins of classrooms and eventually disappear, and to see policies of conserving the past rather than experimenting with the present drive a good deal of the collective's work.

In the case of healthy communities and the dysfunctional ones, the meaning of those settings is socially constructed largely by their members. Over time, tacit and more public agreements are struck, agreements that tell insiders and outsiders what the community is, what it values, and what it expects of itself. If teachers in a school decide over time that students are difficult learners, unwilling students, or recalcitrant scholars, it is more than likely that such will be the case and, if not the case, that the teachers will act as if it were. In another school with many of the same contextual features, the school professionals may conclude over time that their students are good-willed, eager to learn, pleasant to be around, and rich resources of language and culture that can be used to benefit the school community in all of its aspects.

How do these social constructions come to be? What might push us more to the second view than the first? How can a school with a multiple language student population engage its members, adults and students, in creating a school that honors all members rather than only an easily identified few?

In some considerable measure, healthy communities are invitational, and they invite old-timers and newcomers alike to develop a sense of belonging and become participatory rather than passive members. For Hon and Luis, the brief vignette earlier in the paper illustrated how these two newcomers appear to live their school lives on the fringes of participation. A healthier school environment would have institutionalized ways of including Hon, perhaps by having another student become her sidekick or assigning her to a group of boys and girls who have been prepared to anticipate the difficulties of moving into an unfamiliar group.

In much the same manner of inclusiveness, Ms. Carson and Ms. Anderson might have had more to say to one another about Hon, the newcomer, in light of existing school regularities that could be called upon to assist Hon in her first days and to capitalize on Luis's interests as he moves through his instructional program. Ms. Carson and Ms. Anderson would have a more intense feeling about the importance of recognizing individual students, not just because of their immediate classification as "one of them," but as young people with ambitions, histories, prior knowledge, and well-formulated understandings of the nature of the world around them. This idea of recognition and being recognized is a hallmark of a healthy community in that it rests on the assumption that all members are valuable and worth investing in, and whether the investment is one of friendship and regard or one of putting professional expertise into action. To be recognized is to be called by one's rightful name, not to be classified or labeled or demoted to the place of a stranger with continuing status as such.

Communities are known in large part by their accomplishments. For schools, conventional wisdom has had it that accomplishment is that set of scores on a standardized achievement test. As noted earlier, these measures of accomplishment are seriously flawed for most students but particularly so for LMELs. Without abandoning or even lessening the importance of student outcomes as a measure of accomplishment, it is important that we reconsider seriously the outcomes of schooling for all students, not just those who perform well on conventional measures of achievement. This reconsideration should include both the outcomes we value *and* the methods by which we draw conclusions about whether the valued outcomes are achieved.

For newcomers to our nation's schools, it seems reasonable to think of outcomes more broadly than is typical. (My view is that this should be true for all students in our schools.) In terms of these strangers to American language and mainstream culture, it seems reasonable for us to expect of ourselves and them that our work together results in a sense of belonging, a sense of individual identity within a larger group, and a belief that each of us contributes something of value to our times together and to the places where we are together. This sense of belonging, it can be argued, comes about in large measure because of the belief we have that what we do in the community is perceived as important and contributory. It is reciprocal in that when one knows he or she is valued, he or she is likely to value others. When one is

abused, we have found, one has the tendency toward abuse. It is vital for our LMELs that they be convinced to believe that schools and the educational professionals in them care about all students, are eager to work with all students, and will celebrate the accomplishments of all students.

Besides outcomes centering on students' sense of fitting in and being welcomed in schools, we might take a lesson from the teacher-effectiveness studies' finding that breaking down complex ideas and actions into more manageable parts helps in student learning. The complexity of working with LMELs sometimes gets in our way and reduces us to fretting about the enormity of the task. We might think of some of the components of that complexity and work toward realizing them.

For example, what are the pieces of the large-scale difficulty of working with LMELs? The first and most obvious one is communication, not necessarily focused on school subjects but on interpersonal relationships. We might develop strategies that increase the power of LMEL students to speak with their teachers and with one another, using English. This would require a loosening of the ubiquitous "no-talking" rules present in most classrooms. Instead, there would be a "please-talk" rule accompanied by sets of easily learned strategies about how that talk can be true communication—the expression of ideas and opinions and simple reporting. English-speaking students could be encouraged to engage their LMEL peers in conversation, not necessarily about academic content but not excluding those topics. The outcome of student communication, independent of the school subjects, seems a worthy student consequence. This example is only one that could be formulated if we were to broaden our ways of thinking about what it is we want to accomplish if only we could get past thinking only in terms of the enormity of a complex issue and break it down into relevant and contributing parts.

A current catch phrase in educational jargon is "schools as learning communities." It is meant to dramatize the possibilities inherent in schools if all participants, not just children and youth, are engaged in learning. It is assumed that when teachers, for instance, are engaged in pursuing their own learning, they are more likely to be thoughtful about and sympathetic to their students' learning. It also is assumed that when students have public models of learning, models with whom they are in daily contact, they will come to see the advantages of learning over not learning.

A school that is a learning community would tackle the question of how to work with LMELs at all levels. Administrators, because of their more flexible schedules and typically greater access to external resources, would seek out intellectual and practical resources for consideration of teachers working with LMELs. Teachers, individually and collectively, would puzzle through the issues they face and experiment with new and altered teaching methodologies. Support staff would be encouraged in their attempts to gain understanding about how they, like the teachers, could cause their interactions with all students to be somehow educative rather than casual. (I think of the coolly detached or even gruff exchanges between students and cafeteria workers or custodians, exchanges that, if carefully thought about, could help LMELs gain more control over their lives at school.)

A learning community school's boundaries and borders would include parents and other adult community members. It would engage these people around sets of hypotheses aimed at making school for LMELs a successful experience. It would *not* prescribe in advance what these adults are to do or how they are to think. Instead, the adult members of the school would use the community members as intellectual and practical resources, as ways to find out about the school's students, their backgrounds and personal circumstances, their cultures, and so on. Together, the adults inside and outside the school would agree about how they can work together to reinforce the potential for school learning for all students.

An interesting example of this is the current work of Luis Moll (1990; 1994). Moll and his colleagues are conducting a systematic inventory of the intellectual capital that resides in LMELs' homes and neighborhoods. They are discovering that some adults are experts at arts and crafts, others at cooking, others at keeping plants alive and thriving, still others at mechanical tasks. The project staff bring their inventories into school where they and the teachers and the community members work to fashion a school curriculum from the common residue of everyday life in the neighborhoods. The apparent consequences of this joining of the school and neighborhood communities include not just a revision of a school curriculum, but also considerable growth in understanding and empathy across the two groups of adults as well as a joining together of efforts aimed at improving the educational and social lot of LMELs.

Analogous to the connection of home, school, and community is the internal connection that LMELs make when

they join their out-of-school cultural experiences with their school lives. Duran (1993) notes that children extend comments about school text stories to include their personal beliefs, values, and experiences. He sees this as a willingness and a capacity that students have to make more comprehensive sense of the different aspects of their world. At issue is how teachers in schools can capitalize on this interest.

Freedman (1993) testifies to the importance of mentoring in schools. Although we often think of mentoring as a teacher-teacher relationship wherein an experienced veteran teacher helps the novice to learn the rules of the game, or as a way to engage nonschool adults with school students in a kind of "big-brother, big-sister" way, Freedman points out the potential power of school professionals serving as mentors for students in schools. In our case, is it not worthwhile to consider what might happen if teachers, as part of their workloads, would volunteer to be ongoing mentors to certain LMELs? The mentoring of the teachers, of course, would extend far beyond the typical student-teacher relationship and, for some teachers, might be an uncomfortable role to play. Such mentors would serve as touch points for the LMELs who are trying to make sense of the broader American social and cultural context, develop communication skills, formulate beliefs and values, and construct senses of themselves. This extension of teaching to include nonacademic mentoring, though, seems to be a natural one even though it is not a convention of teaching as we have socially constructed our meaning about that work.

Lest this discussion sound too mechanized, too instrumental, it is important to acknowledge that life in healthy communities is sometimes driven by Western notions of "science," but more often is influenced dramatically by storytelling and by recounting personal histories. Conversations take place continuously and everywhere. These conversations, if taken seriously and engaged in thoughtfully, become the stories of a school and of the people in it (Carter, 1993). As we reconceptualize schools less as traditional and abstract "organizations" and more as communities of learning, story and conversation become central concerns for us. How can we construct "our story" such that it is a demonstration of the best we can be rather than a litany of why we can't be the best we can be? As we engage one another in conversation, how can we direct the conversation toward serious concerns and away from laundry lists of unexamined barriers we face? How can we ensure that our conversations and our stories include attention to LMELs in positive and constructive ways

rather than in pejorative and exclusionary ways? And, most important, how can we *include* in our communities of learning the stories and conversations of those who don't speak English and who don't share a common, if often mythic, cultural heritage?

WHAT NOW? A RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT AGENDA FOR TEACHING LMELS

The intent of this occasional paper is to illustrate the interactive properties that must be considered when attempting to make progress in teaching LMELs. The demographics of the issue are staggering in terms of impact upon coastal and border states and some metropolitan regions. The nature of teaching monolingual classes, by itself, is complex but teaching is made even more complicated by the inclusion of LMELs. Teachers are very seldom prepared in their preservice or continuing education programs for dealing effectively with students outside a fairly narrow range of ethnicity, language ability, and social class. Schools as complex cultures and communities are influential upon teachers, students, and the broader society, but that influence has yet to be fully understood or used to the advantage of LMELs.

Teaching, language, culture, school features, and teacher education must all be considered in any attempts to improve the lot of teachers and students who are struggling together in classrooms while struggling alone in their language-bound personal contexts.

What follows is presented as a series of research and development agenda items, but it is important that they be considered *in interaction*. As has been true of our struggle to work effectively and satisfyingly with a number of subgroups of the national school-age population—children of poverty and migrant workers' children come to mind—we are likely to find that sporadic and fragmented attempts to make sense of one piece of the puzzle will not be helpful as we try to understand the larger picture. Certainly, the development, production, and use of true cases, for example, may make some small dent in the understandings of prospective teachers who are caused to think seriously about LMELs, but as these few students move into the gigantic teacher work force, those understandings are bound to get lost in the larger sea of nonunderstanding or misunderstanding. A classroom environment in which a single teacher manages to create a truly communicative environment may help a small number of students in a very limited period of time come to comfort levels in oral communication, but the effects of that single experience are more than likely to be diluted

over years of being in other classrooms with other norms of participation. And the involvement of parents in the kindergarten class's exploration of school and neighborhood may reinforce home and school values for boys and girls for that year, but that reinforcement may be only a seductive gesture followed by subsequent closed-door practices in later grades.

Two conceptual frames should be inferred for this section of the paper. First, *the school is seen as the focus for research and development on working productively with LMELs, not a laboratory or a few classes or a grade level or two.* The school is the logical unit for considering the issue, in that it is the locus of the interacting properties that must be considered together. The school is the community in which students and teacher interact, in which meaning is made, in which perceived issues and problems reside, and where true invention about schooling can be made real. The school is the true and only logical focus for change that impacts students over time rather than only at a point in time. And the issue of LMEL achievement is not amenable to a quick fix, something that can be accomplished in a semester or even a year. Working effectively with LMELs will take sustained effort over time. The school has the opportunity to make meaningful connections with relevant organizations and institutions, such as universities, community organizations, and families, in ways that are beyond the scope of individual teachers or administrators working singly. Certainly, ideas and proposals and materials can be tried out for technical adequacy outside the school walls, but the true test of those ideas will come as they are introduced into an ongoing school setting, adapted to the context features of a particular school, and refined in use over time and in consultation with school professionals and important collaborators such as parents and children.

The second conceptual frame I propose has to do with research and development methodologies. *I have come to believe that it is important in the social sciences, perhaps education particularly, to be more thoughtful about, sensitive to, and supportive of the views of the persons being studied or who are hoped to be the eventual users of our development work.* In the case of research, large-scale and impersonal surveys or "treatments" tend in the long run to give us very little guidance for working in the immediate instance. Our "subjects" remain just that: faceless and nameless and, given our modes of reporting, seemingly unthinking objects. Our methods dilute or erase the small victories, the sometimes devastating disappointments, the one-time-only but eventually epiphany-like

bursts of understanding and action that don't show up in aggregated data sets.

Similarly, in the development of educational materials, we have developed the habit of engaging in that development apart from the persons who we hope will benefit from our labor. Over the past three or four decades, a large number of curriculum packages, developed most often in university settings by some of the best academicians to be found, simply foundered on the way through the classroom doors. The idea that teachers working in a recognizable space with identifiable teachers might have legitimate reasons for rejecting or ignoring the work of the academy was an uncomfortable one to deal with. Yet, as we have come to more fully understand the influence of school and classroom contexts on any attempts to change accepted ways of doing business, some of us have come to believe that the participation of practitioners in the development of educational resources is absolutely vital. It is vital not for the cosmetic reasons of instilling a sense of so-called ownership, although that isn't to be downplayed, but for the more powerful reason that the school professionals have something of importance to contribute in the development work as it is conceptualized and as it moves forward.

Returning to research approaches as they might be most helpful in increasing our intellectual and practical authority in working with LMELs, Smith's (1987) description of four approaches that are representative of the "new paradigm," the shift from long-accepted quantitative methods, is helpful. She identifies "interpretive approaches" with roots in anthropology and sociology that place "an emphasis on the contents of the mind, how they are organized, and how they interact with features of the cultural and social situation" (p. 177). Interpretive approaches call for researchers to attempt to understand the meanings that participants make in a setting of events and their actions. This is a dramatic shift from typical educational research in which outsiders categorize according to their own frameworks what is happening in a setting where they do not hold membership.

Smith also discusses the artistic approach that places considerable emphasis on how studies are presented for examination. Such work is made public in narrative accounts and literary modes rather than in the often dry and inaccessible language of the statistician who is equating human behavior with number proxies. The narrative account, I believe, is particularly

powerful as a development approach as well as a way of reporting inquiry.

Smith's third category is called the systematic approach. In research that is considered systematic, considerable attention is given to issues of objectivity, reliability, and validity. Although data may be collected in almost any way, the data and analyses are rigorously examined in relation to many of the canons of existing quantitative methods.

The last approach noted by Smith is what she calls theory-driven approaches wherein researchers collect data in an attempt to understand the meaning that individuals place upon their actions, similar to the interpretive approach mentioned earlier, but the researchers analyze the data by applying a larger theoretical framework to the analyses. Current examples of this approach can be found in some feminist-oriented and neo-Marxist work.

The reason for including these four perspectives on research (and, to my mind, on development of educational resources) is to underscore the importance I place on the integration of research, development, and the lived world of those people and contexts who are struggling with the dilemmas of teaching LMELs. The agenda below does not match well with many of the readily accepted canons of quantitative educational research and development; it is suited to approaches such as the ones presented by Smith.

Finally, I have been greatly influenced by participation in the original and two subsequent iterations of Interactive Research and Development (IR&D) (Tikunoff, Ward, & Griffin, 1979). The consequences of that influence are apparent in the research and development discussion above and in the agenda that follows. For the most part, the influence shows itself in the relatively blurred distinctions between what is noted as research and what is noted as development. It will be noted that the research questions, in some cases, push into the development arena in that they are aimed at testing existing and emerging notions about working with LMELs. Similarly, the development issues included can all serve as instances of experimental or other research, particularly when one considers evaluation of program consequences as research, as I do. Also, understanding the two conceptual frames that I've placed around these agenda suggestions, it is important to remember that this research is meant to be dependent on the participation and contributions of those persons being studied in ways that conventional "subject" research has ignored. Similarly, most of the development issues require active and thoughtful participation of school professionals

that is well beyond the usual "do-it-this-way" development work. Lastly, both the research questions and development issues must be seen as suggestions to avoid the trap of research "purity" and to ensure that the work is uncontaminated by other variables—a perspective that has driven so much of our educational inquiry. Accepting the frame of the school for both sets of activities, by definition, reduces the kinds and degrees of control that once were held solely in the hand of the researcher or the developer. In these ways, the separation between the research questions and the development issues is not as distinct as is the case traditionally in the social sciences.

The research questions and development issues are organized according to overarching themes that seem to me to be important. It will be noted that there is an occasional sequence suggested, a sequence that suggests concentration on research, then on development, and then on research related to the prior development work. These sequences, given the blurring of distinctions between the research and development already discussed, should be seen largely as a function of presenting the agenda in linear text form. I suspect that the various approaches would, in practice, be considerably less clearly demarcated.

Matters of Competence

Tikunoff (1993) notes the interaction of three kinds of school competence that are at issue for LMELs; participative competence, interactional competence, and academic competence. He further notes the power of the interaction of the three competencies as a function of life in classrooms. It seems to this reader of Tikunoff's work and after reviewing the work of Swain and Cummins (1982) that a number of research and development issues are embedded in this deceptively simple depiction of competence.

Research Questions

Research questions include: Are participative, interactional, and academic competence taxonomic in nature? To what degree do the three competence areas strengthen and detract from one another? What is the threshold of participative competence required for academic competence?

How are participative and interactional competence areas affected by (a) teacher expectations and behavior, (b) number and nature of classroom-required peer communication, (c) participation in academically oriented group work such as

cooperative learning, (d) cross-age grouping, and (e) adult-student mentoring occasions?

Development Issues

Development issues include: creation of alternate modes of communicating to teachers the available (and forthcoming) understanding of the competence issues, including use of technology, school-based and entire-faculty discussion and action groups; and formulation of an inventory of the areas of competence to be used by teachers as a resource in making instructional decisions.

Research Questions

Research questions include: What is found when tracking the nature and influence of teachers' knowledge about competence issues in relation to classroom practice? Are there differences among teachers that can be attributed to the various modes of developing meaning about LMEL competence?

Matters of Teacher Beliefs, Theories, and Expectations

All teachers have theories about instruction, how it should move ahead, what its consequences should be, how students should participate, and so on. This occasional paper has suggested the power of these theories, beliefs, and expectations to influence work with LMELs. In conventional, English-only classrooms, teacher theories are influential upon instruction and its consequences.

Research Questions

Research questions include: How are teachers' theories of instruction related to teacher behavior, interactions with students, and student outcomes? Are the theories open to change? Under what conditions? Does an expanded knowledge base about LMELs alter the theories or instructional behavior? What patterns of theory about working with LMELs characterize teachers' stories about their work? How do personal histories relate to theories, practice, and student outcomes in LMEL settings?

Development Issues

Development issues include: use of story as a means to unpack teachers' often hidden theories, beliefs, and expectations; implementation of a practical arguments strategy as a way for teachers to discover their underlying theories; use of personal journal writing and reflection as a means for teachers to organize their theories in relation to working with LMELs.

Matters of School Context

This occasional paper has suggested that the school be considered as the primary focusing organization for research and development activity. Although some meaning has accrued to support this proposal, it is necessary to buttress it with studies and interventions that include careful and targeted attention to schools with large numbers of LMELs.

Research Questions

Research questions include: What are the nature and character of school-specific variables associated with positive academic and communicative consequences for LMELs? To what degree do the so-called "effective-schools" features stand up as predictors of success in LMEL-dominated schools? What are the consequences of extending the school community to include parents and other adult community members? What school-based strategies are most powerful in attracting nonschool adults to school participation? What must be present in the school context to ensure effective participation by nonschool adults?

Development Issues

Development issues include: text and other easily distributed materials to be used in working with nonschool adults on LMEL projects; research- and theory-based conceptual frameworks suggesting how such work might be carried forward and studied; formulation of procedures to gather community and family relevant information for use by curriculum workers and staff developers in the schools.

Research Questions

Research questions include: What are the consequences for school professionals and for LMELs when the school culture is expanded to include nonschool adults? What are the

consequences for nonschool adults when the school culture invites them to participate? What school-level variables, when in place, are associated with the opening up of the school culture?

Matters of Student Identity

Though there are many survey reports that tell us the ethnicity and language of the LMELs in our schools, those gross characterizations are seldom helpful as teachers interact with students in their classes. A major hypothesis to be tested is whether and how more detailed and student-specific information might be used by teachers in instruction.

Research Questions

Research questions include: What information about LMELs is used in what ways by teachers? What other information do teachers believe would be helpful? How and why? How can this information be collected most efficiently and with greatest sensitivity to LMELs' often precarious status in schools? Which of this information is most useful to teachers? How is usefulness by teachers determined? Are there apparent alterations in instructional practice in terms of the kinds of information held by teachers?

Development Issues

Development issues include: formulation and field test of student-specific information gathering procedures; various modes of transforming the information into usable forms for teachers and other school professionals; development of computerized data bank for use by teachers and school administrators; compilation and distribution of survey statistics as information for school professionals.

Matters of LMEL Assessment

A good deal has been said and written about the problems associated with persistent use of standardized tests of student achievement as demonstrations of student learning and of teaching effectiveness. Despite this longstanding criticism, there are few other options for student assessment available for use by teachers and administrators. In large measure, the absence of other routes to assessment can be attributed to the paucity of debate and discourse about what kinds of student outcome data would be acceptable and important to school professionals. In the case of LMEL schools, the absence of alternate sets of acceptable evidence is joined by the absence of alternate foci for

assessment. In other words, what assessment information about LMEL progress in schools would be useful to teachers and how might the information be collected?

Research Questions

Research questions include: What do teachers, school administrators, and scholars believe to be important aspects of LMEL behavior that might form an assessment scheme? How might information about these aspects be collected reliably and validly? To what use is this information put? To what effect?

Matters of Professional Resources for Teachers

This paper, like so many similar treatments of other topics, assumes a fairly sophisticated knowledge of research, theory, and practice on the part of the reader. This assumption, it is fair to say, holds true across much of the educational literature, particularly that written by researchers and other members of the academy. Unfortunately, the communication systems easily managed by academy peers often are not shared by others concerned with educational issues (e.g., many teachers and administrators, most of the public). The dependence upon specialized, often arcane and exotic language is a definite roadblock to achieving solid communication lines across elementary school, secondary school, and higher education settings. Although this has been known for decades (and decried for decades), little has been done to ameliorate the problem.

Development Issues

Development issues include: use of teachers' and LMELs' personal histories and first-person stories in case development (as opposed to fictionalized accounts often prepared by non-LMEL adults); creation of a computer-based server system for teacher-teacher exchanges around issues of working with LMELs; preparation of study guides designed to assist (not prescribe) school-based professionals to formulate their context-specific plans for working with LMELs.

Research Questions

Research questions include: What are the consequences for the various parties of the implementation and use of the materials noted above? What context and professional factors are associated with high use, satisfaction of use, and impact upon

practice (i.e., the interaction of the materials with the context in which they are used)?

Matters of Teacher Preparation

As noted earlier, competition for time and space and energy in teacher preparation programs is fierce. For careful attention to be given to the issues identified here, a typical teacher education program's faculty would probably believe that something would have to be excluded from an existing program. This seldom happens in most higher education programs of study.

Research Questions

Research questions include: What is the current status of LMEL-oriented instruction in existing teacher education programs? To what degree is this instruction integrated into or set apart from core courses and field experiences? What do teacher educators believe to be the role of such instruction, current or anticipated, in their professional sequence of studies? Where is information about LMEL instruction best learned—college/university or school settings? What are the consequences of those different sites for the character of instruction? Are there benefits associated with "weighting" admission to teacher education toward inclusion of prospective teachers with multicultural, multilingual prior experience (as is the case in some preservice programs)? What are the consequences for prospective teachers of participation in action research and/or IR&D inquiry experiences focused on LMEL learning?

Development Issues

Development issues include: preparation and distribution of illustrative program statements, one of which demonstrates how LMEL instruction can be integrated into a typical professional sequence of studies and one of which outlines possible content of delivery of LMEL-related content in separate coursework/ fieldwork; working seminars on LMEL-related content for college- and school-based teacher educators across institution of higher education (IHE) and local education agency (LEA) organizational boundaries; regional conference on LMEL instruction for IHE and LEA instructional/policy leaders.

Matters of Teacher Roles

Ward (1993) lists a number of new conceptions of teacher role. In these new conceptions, it is clear that teachers are believed to be able and willing to assume leadership well beyond what is

typical in most school settings (e.g., assuming leadership for school-based innovations, participating in schoolwide policy and decision bodies, serving as school experts on matters of persistent concern). Linking the issues of school context as focus and LMEL achievement as intention, it is possible to conceive of expanded teacher roles as means to ensure that this conceptual linkage is productive.

Research Questions

Research questions include: What role requirements are associated with the preparation and functioning of a school-based LMEL teacher resource person? What intellectual, contextual, and procedural knowledge is required of such a teacher? What non-LMEL-related knowledge and skills are associated with success in the role?

Development Issues

Development issues include: designate a PDS as a LMEL-specific learning site; demonstrate cross-experience level teams (preservice, experienced teachers) to investigate (e.g., through action research, IR&D) issues and strategies for working with LMELs; link the PDS to other LMEL-populated schools as technical assistance provider and institutional colleague.

Research Questions

Research questions include: What are the consequences of the development activities listed above? For whom? To what degree do the activities appear to have impact upon student learning (broadly conceived as in the outcomes discussion earlier)?

Matters of Staff Development for Experienced Teachers

This paper has suggested that current patterns of experienced teacher professional development, as provided by school districts for the most part, are insufficient to a majority of tasks to which they are directed. This conclusion flies in the face of the burgeoning body of research and observations of practice that points toward intuitively appealing ways of thinking about and engaging in staff development.

Research Questions

Research questions include: What process-driven (rather than conventional outcome-oriented) staff development opportunities could be productively used in improving the teaching and learning in LMEL settings? What are the consequences of introducing and sustaining an inquiry approach to teacher development in LMEL settings? Action research? IR&D? Case use? Case development? Teacher-to-teacher observation and follow-up? Teacher-initiated and teacher-led? Connections to other similar education settings? Use of technology as teacher and school linkage mechanisms?

Development Issues

Development issues include: Identify demonstration sites; infuse sites with opportunities to engage individually and collectively with the issues identified in this paper; provide sustained human, intellectual, and material support for school-based problem solving; use the processes of LMEL-oriented problem solving as the focus for staff development; construct resource materials as required by the demonstration sites for use there and in subsequent iterations; link demonstration sites through computer-based server systems; use demonstration sites as teacher-led opportunities for teams of teachers in other sites to participate in and learn from ongoing work; with teacher and scholar participation, develop a resource laboratory dealing with LMEL-related issues, with the laboratory including print, human, and technological resources.

Research issues

Research issues include: Track the processes and consequences of the various development strategies included above; codify the strategies according to existing and emerging theory; compare the strategies according to a conceptual framework that includes practice issues as well as theoretical constructs.

CONCLUSION

This occasional paper has provided a discussion of the issue of teaching in multilingual classrooms from a variety of perspectives that current understanding suggest may be helpful as we come to face the challenges of teaching LMELs in our schools. The discussion, to some, may be overly cumbersome and circuitous.

Few clear lessons for practice are to be found, although a number of speculations, suggestions, and questions is advanced. The final section of this paper proposes a very comprehensive research and development agenda that I believe might help us focus on, as well as gain some modest control over, the issues of our changing elementary and secondary school language environments.

The paper may seem too broad, too inclusive. At issue, though, is whether we can exert the wit and the will required to teach all children, not just the children who fall in the narrow band of "middle classness," defined so often in terms of family and personal histories of speaking English. For most of us, the role of teacher is different from the way we thought of our work when we began. For some of us, the work of teaching has become more challenging and, as a result, more rewarding. For others of us, the work has become more challenging but, sadly, less satisfying in its ambiguity and our uncertainty. It is hoped that the challenges and possibilities of our work with all students, including LMELs, can be conceptualized and enacted as ways for us to grow in our work, to become the kinds of teachers who will contribute to the enhancement of personal meaning and academic accomplishment of all students.

REFERENCES

Bentzen, M. M. (1974). *Changing schools: The magic feather principle*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Buchmann, M. (1989). *The lights that teachers live by*. East Lansing: Michigan State University.

Carter, K. (1993). *Experts in teaching diverse student populations: A resource for teacher development?* Paper prepared for the Southwest Regional Laboratory's Metropolitan Educational Trends and Research Outcomes Center seminar, Teachers for the 1990s and Beyond. Los Alamitos, CA: Southwest Regional Laboratory.

Cochran-Smith, M. (1993). *Color blindness and basket making are not the answers: Confronting the dilemmas of race, culture, and language diversity in teacher education.* Paper prepared for the Southwest Regional Laboratory's Metropolitan Educational Trends and Research Outcomes Center seminar, Teachers for the 1990s and Beyond. Los Alamitos, CA: Southwest Regional Laboratory.

Cohen, D. (1991). *Plus ce que change: Change in American schools*. East Lansing: Michigan State University.

Copeland, W. D. (1993). *Teacher education as the development of meaning: Preparation to teach linguistically and culturally diverse students*. Paper prepared for the Southwest Regional Laboratory's Metropolitan Educational Trends and Research Outcomes Center seminar, Teachers for the 1990s and Beyond. Los Alamitos, CA: Southwest Regional Laboratory.

Cummins, J. (1981). The role of primary language development in promoting educational success for language minority students. In California Department of Education, *Schooling and language minority students: A theoretical framework.* Los Angeles: Evaluation Dissemination and Assessment Center, California Department of Education.

Doyle, W. (1986). Classroom organization and management. In P. L. Peterson & H. J. Walberg (Eds.), *Handbook of research on teaching* (3rd ed.). New York: Macmillan.

Duran, R. P. (1993). *Construction of learning and interaction of language minority children in cooperative learning.* Paper prepared for the Southwest Regional Laboratory's Metropolitan Educational Trends and Research Outcomes Center seminar, Teachers for the 1990s and Beyond. Los Alamitos, CA: Southwest Regional Laboratory.

Evans, J. W., Wals, I. S., Smreker C., & Ventresca, M. J. (1989). A sociodemographic portrait. In Policy Analysis for California Education (Ed.), *Conditions of Children in California.* Berkeley, CA: School of Education, University of California.

Freedman, M. (1993). *The kindness of strangers: Adult mentors, urban youth, and the new voluntarism.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Fullan, M. G. (1990). Staff development, innovation, and institutional development. In B. Joyce (Ed.), Changing school culture through staff development (pp. 3-25). Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Griffin, G. A., & Barnes, S. (1986). Using research findings to change school and classroom practices: Results of an experimental study. *American Educational Research Journal, 23*(4), 572-586.

Griffin, G. A., Lieberman, A. L., & Jacullo-Noto, J. (1983). *Interactive research and development on schooling: Final report.* New York: Teachers College, Columbia University.

Jackson, P. W. (1968). *Life in classrooms.* New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

Hoffman, J., Griffin, G., Edwards, S., Paulissen, M., Barnes, S., Edwards, S., Salinas, A., & Defino, M. (1986). *Teacher induction: Final report of a descriptive study.* Austin, TX: Research and Development Center for Teacher Education.

Holmes Group. (1986). *Tomorrow's teachers.* East Lansing, MI: Holmes Group.

Kirp, D. L. (1990, August 12). The classroom according to Hunter. *Los Angeles Times*, pp. 16-23.

Lieberman. A. (Ed.). (1990). *Schools as collaborative cultures: Creating the future now*. New York: Falmer.

Little, J. W. (1990). Teachers as colleagues. In A. Lieberman, (Ed.), *Schools as collaborative cultures: Creating the future now*. New York: Falmer.

Lortie, D. (1975). *Schoolteacher: A sociological study*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Macias, R. F. (1993). Language and ethnic classification of language minorities: Chicano and Latino students in the 1990s. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences, 15*(2), 230-257.

Moll, L. (1994). *A conversation about caring and community*. Paper presented at the University of Arizona Seminar on Caring and Community, Tucson.

Moll, L., Velez-Ibanez, C., & Greenberg, J. (1990). *Community knowledge and classroom practice: Combining resources for literacy instruction*. Arlington, VA: Development Associates.

Roberts, S. (1994). *A portrait of America based on the latest U.S. Census*. New York: Time Books/Random House.

Sarason. S. B. (1971). *The culture of the school and the problem of change*. New York: Allyn and Bacon.

Schubert, W., & Ayers, W. (1993). *Teacher lore*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Slavin, R. (1992). Cooperative learning. In M. R. Wittrock (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of educational research* (6th ed.). New York: Macmillan.

Smith. M. L. (1987). Publishing qualitative research. *American Educational Research Journal, 224*(2), 173-183.

Southwest Regional Laboratory. (1992, September). *Desegregation-related needs in Arizona, California, and Nevada*. Los Alamitos, CA: Author.

Swain, M., & Cummins, J. (1982). Bilingualism, cognitive functioning and education. In V. Kinsella (Ed.), *Surveys 1: Eight state-of-the-art articles on key areas in language teaching*. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.

Tikunoff, W. J. (1993). *Teaching the linguistically diverse.* Paper prepared for the Southwest Regional Laboratory's Metropolitan Educational Trends and Research Outcomes Center seminar, Teachers for the 1990s and Beyond. Los Alamitos, CA: Southwest Regional Laboratory.

Tikunoff, W. J., & Ward, B. A. (1991, April). Competences of teachers of ethnolinguistically diverse student groups. In L. Wagner (Chair), *Measuring teacher ability to teach diverse student groups*. Symposium conducted at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago.

Tikunoff, W. J., Ward, B. A., van Broekhuizen, L. D., Romero, M., Vega Castaneda, L., Lucas, T., & Katz, A. (1991). *A descriptive study of significant features of exemplary special alternative instructional programs (final report).* Larkspur, CA: Southwest Regional Laboratory.

Tikunoff, W. J., Ward, B. A., & Griffin, G. A. (1979). *Interactive research and development on schooling: Final report.* San Francisco: Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development.

Trueba, H. T. (1989). *Raising silent voices: Educating the linguistic minorities for the 21st century.* New York: Newbury House.

Ward, B. A. (1993). *Professionalizing teaching: What does it mean for teacher development and teacher responsibility for improving instruction of diverse student populations?* Paper prepared for the Southwest Regional Laboratory's Metropolitan Educational Trends and Research Outcomes Center seminar, Teachers for the 1990s and Beyond. Los Alamitos, CA: Southwest Regional Laboratory.

Ward, B. A., Dianda, M. R., van Broekhuizen, L. D., Radio, J. & Quartz, K. H. (1992). *Support component of the California New Teacher Project: Third-year evaluation report.* Los Alamitos, CA: Southwest Regional Laboratory.

Ward, B. A., Dianda, M. R., & Tushnet, N. C. (1990). *Support component of California new teacher project: First year evaluation report.* Los Alamitos, CA: Southwest Regional Laboratory.

APPENDIX

List of Authors and Their Papers
at
Teachers for the 1990s and Beyond

The following is a list of authors and their papers prepared for SWRL's METRO Center Seminar, Teachers for the 1990s and Beyond. Copies of the papers may be obtained by writing to:

METRO Center
Southwest Regional Laboratory
4665 Lampson Avenue
Los Alamitos, CA 90720
(310) 598-7661

K. Carter, Arizona University, College of Education, Teaching and Teacher Education
Experts in Teaching Diverse Student Populations: A Resource for Teacher Development

M. Cochran-Smith, University of Pennsylvania, Graduate School of Education
Color Blindness and Basket Making Are Not the Answers: Confronting the Dilemmas of Race, Culture, and Language Diversity in Teacher Education

W. D. Copeland, University of California, Santa Barbara, Graduate School of Education
Educating New Teachers for the 1990s and Beyond

R. P. Duran, University of California, Santa Barbara, Graduate School of Education
Construction of Learning and Interaction of Minority Language Children in Cooperative Learning

W. Secada, University of Wisconsin, College of Education, Curriculum and Instruction
Reform, Diversity, and Teacher Instructional Knowledge

W. J. Tikunoff, Southwest Regional Laboratory
Teaching the Ethnolinguistically Diverse

B. A. Ward, Southwest Regional Laboratory
Professional Teaching: What Does it Mean for Teacher Development and Teacher Responsibility for Improving Instruction of Diverse Student Populations?

B. Warren, & F. Conant, Technical Educational Research Centers, Inc.
Equity in the Future Tense: Redefining Relationships Among Teachers, Students, and Science in Linguistic Minority Classrooms